DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 719 HE 006 644

AUTHOR Pfnister, Allan O.
TITLE Trends in Higher Education in the United States. No. 4. Instructional Programs. A Review of Recent Literature. A Report to the Commission on the Future, the Lutheran Educational Conference of North America.
INSTITUTION Lutheran Educational Conference of North America, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 98p.; For related documents see, HE 006 640-645
AVAILABLE FROM Allan O. Pfnister, Professor of Higher Education, University of Denver, 2199 S. University Blvd. Denver, Colorado 80210. ($3.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Course Content; *Curriculum; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; *Higher Education; *Instructional Design; Instructional Programs; *Literature Reviews; Program Content; *Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

Changing curriculum involves more than effecting variations in content of particular courses; it involves the sum total of experiences afforded the student in the pursuit of his educational objectives. Rather than debate whether what is happening is new or different or evidence of change, this review of the current literature reports what is being written about curriculum and leaves it to the reader to make judgments about degrees or kinds of change. There is an attempt to compare program elements over time and to analyse these trends toward change in terms of three kinds of responses by institutions that have resulted in new programs: (1) the creation of new institutions; (2) the transformation of existing institutions as in the "cluster colleges" and the "college-within-college" as well as totally reorganized colleges; and (3) change through accretion and attrition, i.e., the addition of new programs or emphases and the droping of old programs. The transformation is illustrated by gradual changes and developments in general education, in the areas of concentration or majors; the development of new areas of concentration; the changes in academic calenders to allow for more course experimentation; and procedural changes, such as new grading systems, variations in advising, development of contract and performance-based courses, and others. (JMF)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED112719

TRENDS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

NO. 4 INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
(A Review of Recent Literature)

A Report to
The Commission on the Future

THE LUTHERAN EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE OF NORTH AMERICA

Allan O. Pfnister
University of Denver

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Allan O. Pfnister
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

March, 1975

HE 006 644

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America
955 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W. Suite 4500 North Building Washington, D.C. 20024

Preface

This is one of six monographs written during the period covering the latter half of 1974 and the first months of 1975 and that review developments in American higher education through the mid-1970s. The sources have been articles and books published in large part between 1964 and 1975. Writing during this period has been voluminous, augmented in the last five years by the many reports, staff studies and other project prompted by, or related to, the work of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The output has been so great that it is difficult for the college administrator, much less a faculty member involved in his own discipline, to view the literature in any broad perspective.

When the Lutheran Education Conference of North America established its Commission on the Future in 1972, it developed a series of proposals for projects that would result in documents useful for planning among the colleges related to the Lutheran Church. One of the resources requested by the Commission on the Future was an overview of the current status of higher education in the United States as that was reflected in the contemporary literature. In addition, the Commission requested that this overview be particularly directed to the implications for planning for the Lutheran colleges.

In early 1974 I was asked to undertake this particular phase of the work of the Commission. After the Commission approved a preliminary outline, and after I had completed certain other commitments, including meetings in Germany and Switzerland in June, 1974, I turned to the development of these monographs. I had considered assembling the materials in a single and fairly brief report. As the writing progressed, however, it became obvious that I would not be able to complete the work, at least to my satisfaction, in a single document. After making several revisions in the format, I decided on six monographs, five of which would deal with general topics, and the sixth of which would focus upon the colleges related to the

Lutheran Educational Conference of North America. The Commission on the Future reviewed drafts of four of the monographs in October, 1974 and approved the continuation of the work.

The six monographs are being issued under the general title of Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature. The titles of the six monographs are:

No. 1 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Enrollments

No. 2 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Students in the 70s

No. 3 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Governance (Organization and Administration)

No. 4 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Instructional Programs

No. 5 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Financing the Program

No. 6 Trends in American Higher Education: A Review of Recent Literature--Implications for the Predominantly Undergraduate Church-Related Institution

The monographs, while each of them is fairly lengthy, do not pretend to present an exhaustive analysis of all of the literature that has been produced. The selection of books and articles from which the material is drawn was arbitrary. These are the items considered by the author to be of significance and that were readily accessible to him and that would appear to be readily accessible to those who would be using the monographs. Each monograph provides a substantial cross-section of the writing and opinion on each of the topics. The sixth monograph draws upon the preceding five monographs and attempts to outline specific implications for planning for predominantly undergraduate church-related institutions. It will be noted that, and this is particularly the case for the most recent information, the monographs draw heavily upon the Chronicle of Higher Education. The Chronicle provides the most up-to-date references on the items covered; some of the references are taken from issues in December 1974 and January 1975.

--Allan O. Pfnister
Professor of Higher Education
University of Denver
January 1975

Writing About the College Curriculum: One Decade Plus

The Sixties.--Early in 1962 the volume, The American College, with an impressive subtitle "A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning" and well over one thousand pages of text appeared. The first printing was exhausted almost at once, and a second printing was issued by April, to be followed by many additional printings and even a shorter version entitled College and Character two years later. The editor of The American College, Nevitt Sanford, participated in the Seventeenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education in 1962 as a member of a panel speaking on "Ends and Means in Higher Education", and he expressed surprise at the enthusiasm with which the book had been received. When the writers responsible for developing the book first considered the potential public, they only hoped that the publisher would be able to break even on the enterprise. But The American College captured the attention of a wide audience; it was one of the first comprehensive treatments of American higher education in the post-war years.

For one of the chapters in The American College Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford collaborated in an essay about curriculum development. They wrote:

> Despite its central place in the program of the college, the curriculum rarely has been made the object of systematic investigation. There is, of course, a vast literature on the curriculum, but most of it has been concerned with descriptions of existing programs and with proposals for reform rather than with the demonstration of effects upon students....It seems to

> have been almost universally assumed by educators that the college curriculum, as presently constituted, defines the goals of achievement for the student and that the nature of the curriculum is to be largely determined by whatever is the present state of the 'body of knowledge.' This assumption usually implies (1) an identification of the 'body of knowledge' with the curriculum of the graduate school--a very debatable identification--and (2) only very limited attention to the role of such knowledge and the development of the student.[1]

The essay continued with a sometimes eloquent plea for more attention to personality development of students and made a strong case for a much broader conception of the meaning of curriculum.

While Katz and Sanford referred to a "vast literature on the curriculum", the amount of writing by current standards was fairly limited. In the Book Exhibit at the Nineteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education in 1964, just over a decade ago, less than one hundred books were singled out for inclusion as significant volumes under the category of "Undergraduate Curricula." These items carried publication dates between 1958 through 1964, and ranged down to a nine-page circular published by the Association for Higher Education and entitled "Experimental Colleges Since World War II." Two aspects of curriculum seemed to dominate the writing in this particular collection. At least 25 percent of the volumes dealt in one way or another with questions of general education and liberal education. Another 20 percent could be associated with some phase of teacher education. Various aspects of international education appeared to be the focus of 10 percent of the titles. The remaining 45 percent reflected a wide variety of concerns and included a substantial number of reports on individual institutional programs.

A year later, in 1965, McGraw-Hill issued the volume, Higher Education: Some Newer Developments in connection with the Twentieth Annual National Conference on Higher Education. The preface to that volume begins with a reference to the "crisis of numbers" in higher education, and refers to the "flood of students" bearing down on higher educational institutions. The enrollment in 1960 had been 3.6 million students, and a figure of 7.0 million was projected for 1970 and 8.7 million in 1975. (Parenthetically, it may be noted that an enrollment of some 8.5 million had already been reached in 1970, and reports for fall 1973 indicated an enrollment of 9.6 million students.) Those who were prepared to assume the role of prophet in 1965 were also anticipating a current expenditure figure of 9.8 billion dollars in 1969-1970 (it was actually 21.5 billion.) Against this background of a mood of expansion the editor of the volume, Samuel Baskin, summarized what appeared to be the main trends apparent in 1965.

> As the press of numbers has continued, institutions of higher learning have sought to find ways of maintaining the qualities of smallness while continuing to grow....Several institutions have dealt with this problem by establishing small autonomous colleges, each with its own faculty and student body, within the larger parent body....Similar efforts to achieve smallness in the face of increasing numbers are seen in...[the] establishment of a federation of small colleges within the framework of its university.
>
> While undergraduate colleges have long made use of independent study, these programs have generally been reserved for the superior or honor students on[illegible] There are several new elements in the way independent study is now being employed in a number of institutions: (1) as an experience common to all students... (2) at the very beginning of the student's career...(3) the incorporation of procedures which make use of new media and technology....[There are also] winter term programs. Other institutions...give prominent attention to the use of independent study as a regular part of the students' undergraduate experience.
>
> In recent years several institutions have been giving consideration to ways by which they might make fuller use of the dormitory as a center for learning as well as living....
>
> No development has received more attention in recent years than the new media and technology. Of particular note have been developments in the use of television and programmed instruction; the growth of language laboratories; the development of new media materials, such as 8-mm film loops and single-concept films...the development of facilities for the automatic playback of lectures

> in both audio and video form...and the development of new teaching auditoriums....The learning resources centers bring together a wide variety of resource materials and production and distribution facilities for use in the college's instructional program...several developments in the use of the computer hold significant possibilities for higher education....
>
> Much experimentation is now going on in campus architecture and building design. A number of the developments are concerned with more effective use of the college's teaching and learning spaces, particularly in the employment of new media and technology.... Paralleling developments in the use of independent study, several institutions employ or plan to employ tutorial and seminar type of programs during the student's freshman year....
>
> Many colleges are moving toward year-round operation, staying in session for a total of forty to forty-eight weeks, as contrasted with the usual two-semester plan, under which the college year runs for a period of thirty-two to thirty-six weeks....There is little question that undergraduate programs of study abroad have become an increasingly important part of the student's undergraduate college experience....Complementing the developments in programs of study abroad are new course developments and special-area offerings designed to increase the student's knowledge of world affairs.
>
> An increasing number of colleges are making use of some form of off-campus experience as a part of the student's undergraduate program. The trend here is not so much toward the adoption of alternating programs of work and study, as in colleges operating under the cooperative plan...as it is toward the development of flexible calendar plans that require or encourage the student to spend one or more quarters in some kind of off-campus or field experience....Few changes in higher education have come more rapidly than the dramatic increase in programs for the abler or gifted student....Most of the new honors programs make use of a wide variety of procedures in the accomplishment of their objectives. These include seminars, colloquia, independent study, theme groups, senior theses, research projects, waiver of course requirements, advanced placement and credit by examination, use of student honors committees and program development, honors centers...and the use of honors students, where feasible, in teaching, research, and counseling roles.[2]

Baskin concluded by indicating that institutions were also giving increased attention to various types of interinstitutional cooperation.

The Current Scene.--In the mid-1970s we are experiencing enrollments considerably beyond those projected a decade ago, and, even adjusting dollar amounts for inflation, we find that current expenditures are much beyond those projected in 1964-65. We also find the writing about higher education has increased severalfold. However, as we look to the future, instead of forseeing a "tidal wave" of students, we are anticipating more gradual growth during the remainder of the current decade and some consider not at all unlikely a leveling off during the 1980s and 1990s. With the steady-state in enrollment we have also found growing disillusionment on the part of the general public with higher education, and we are experiencing a financial crunch that has been characterized as a "new depression" in higher education. Our mood alternates between deep gloom and hope simply for survival.

We find in current writing about curricular innovation reference to many of the developments reported by Baskin and his colleagues to be new in 1965. Perhaps there are fewer suggestions about how to maintain smallness within larger institutions. Independent study has been expanded to include various kinds of "non-traditional" study opportunities. There is somewhat less emphasis placed upon residence halls as centers for learning as in recent years we have seen a substantial exodus of students from the residence halls (although the fall of 1974 suggests some reversal in the trend, but for financial rather than programming reasons.) We are still writing about the new media and technology. Seminars at the freshman level may be receiving somewhat more attention. While the primary emphasis may not be upon year-around learning, an incredible variety of calendars has appeared. Study abroad seems to have reached a peak, and may be leveling off or declining as costs overseas increase. There continues to be significant development in off-campus experiences, and these are basic ingredients in the expanding "non-traditional" types of programs for the abler student as greater emphasis is being placed upon the disadvantaged and minority students in the effort to broaden the base of higher education. Interinstitutional cooperation of various types continues, although some of the consortia developed in the 1960s have faced difficulties and some have even gone out of existence.

As we consider the shape and form of the instructional program in the decade ahead, we are told both that the competition engendered by the restriction in funds will lead to more experimentation and that it will eliminate most experimentation altogether. We even have mixed signals regarding the need for reform. National conferences and national commissions address themselves to innovation and reform, and one state legislature has requested its Council on Higher Education to "submit findings and recommendations...concerning ways to encourage the development and implementation of...innovative programs."[3] Yet, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education can report in the volume entitled Reform on Campus that two-thirds of the students in a national and large-scale survey indicated that they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with academic life today. Only 12 percent were "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied."[4] The report does, however, say that in spite of the high level of general satisfaction there are some changes that seem to be desired by both students and faculty members. The changes are of a general sort, such as improvement in teaching effectiveness, achievement of more "relevance" in the curriculum, provision of more creative opportunities for students, and greater attention to the "emotional growth" of the students.[5]

Much more forceful in asking for institutional reform is Ernest Boyer, chancellor of the State University of New York. Speaking at the Twenty-Ninth National Conference on Higher Education in 1974, Boyer accused colleges and universities in the United States of failing to recognize and respond to the profound changes in the life pattern of their actual and potential clientele:

> Our people are organizing their lives in strange new ways, yet our colleges have not caught up with this social revolution in our midst....Historically, the span of human life has been chopped into slices....the thin slice of early childhood.... a thicker slice--twelve to twenty years, perhaps--devoted almost exclusively to full-time learning....the /still/ thicker slice of full-time work. And, finally...retirement..../and/ throughout the years colleges and universities have conformed to this long tradition, serving just one slice of life.[6]

What is needed, Boyer contends, is that higher education construct entirely new arrangements that will respond to the changing social patterns in which life is no longer sliced into discrete periods and in which individuals vary greatly in life style.

While offering a somewhat different set of proposals for the future development of higher education than those later discussed by Boyer, Charles Silberman also calls for a reexamination of functions:

> Higher education needs to rediscover its sense of purpose. It will not be easy to do so, for we are just coming out of a twenty-year absence from serious thought about educational goals....there is something irrational in our contemporary neglect of systematic thought about educational goals.[7]

He points up what he considers to be the obvious fact that any curriculum involves judgment about goals and values and the priorities attached to them, and the failure adequately to examine seriously and systematically educational goals results in poor and ineffective curriculum planning.

Not all writers on the subject are sanguine about the outcomes of attempts at reform. Harold Taylor caricatures the typical faculty approach to curricular reform, the appointment of the committee that must represent a cross section of the academic departments, the lack of empirical research or philosophical analysis and the inevitable compromises, all of which lead to a certain universal sameness in institutional planning:

> The educational plans which result have a sameness about them no matter where they are written, since they tend to accept the same premises and are written by the same kind of people. The curriculum for undergraduates is most often a composite of what each section of the university departments wants to have included in the course material, and the fact of sameness is then interpreted as a kind of universal wisdom among informed scholars as to what constitutes a proper education for all undergraduates. What is actually a consensus of the academic profession as to how its subject matter can be distributed and administered effectively in fairness to themselves is mistaken for a universal educational truth.[8]

In a more recent article, David Bayley of the University of Denver is even more critical of faculty efforts at curriculum change. He observes that "great is the passion spent in searching for the perfect curriculum" and "so perennially is the search undertaken" that there are "few teachers indeed who are not plunged into despair at the very mention of it." Even more tragic, according to Bayley, is the fact that the only distinctive aspect "of these tiresome, agonizing, and repetitious appraisals is their puniness."[9]

What are we to conclude? We observe that many of the exciting "new" measures advanced in the mid-1970s were discussed in the literature more than a decade ago, that many innovations appear to be old ideas in new dress, but that the demand is no less insistent that higher education adapt new social conditions, that a complete overhaul of academe is needed, and yet that faculties never really change much of anything. Confusing? Yes? But perhaps the confusion and extremes of opinion are indicators of the current wave of concern that all is not right with higher education and whether innovative or not, programs must be reviewed and either modified or reaffirmed. At least this is the impression that comes as one views the 120 pages of An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform, another report of the Carnegie Commission. The impression is strong that virtually every college in the country is involved in some kind of "reform" or "innovative" program.[10] This seems to be the case even as we are also reminded that diversity in higher education is declining and that conscious effort will be necessary to maintain what is viewed by some as desirable diversity.[11] In the introduction to Institutions in Transition, Clark Kerr finds educational institutions becoming more alike:

> Taken as a whole, the amount of institutional diversity in American higher education is decreasing. This is due partially to the pervasive existence of a single status system in higher education, based on the prestigious university offering many graduate programs and preoccupied with research. There are few alternative models to this system now functioning.[12]

The same theme is expressed in Jencks and Riesman in The Academic Revolution as they trace the development of the large and influential research universities and the kind of impact those institutions have had upon other institutions, an echo of the position Riesman had earlier taken in Constraint and Variety in American Education.[13]

There are some differences of opinion regarding the extent to which innovations once begun have been able to persevere. A report in U.S. News and World Report states that many of the changes effected during the 1960s are persisting and having an impact upon institutions in the 1970s, but it also notes that some of the reforms, including "pass-fail" as a substitute for regular grading, seem to be falling out of favor and that some of the more unstructured "experimental courses" are not as popular as they were initially. The article points out that there is a good bit of experimentation within the context of maintaining academic standards, that changes in calendar, the adoption of interim programs, efforts at providing more flexible ways of meeting institutional requirements as well as the reduction of institutional requirements are solid accomplishments.[14]

When Arthur Levine and John Weingart reported on their study of 26 institutions which they began with the assumption that innovative programs such as those which gave students an opportunity to plan their own education would be quite successful, that team-taught and interdisciplinary programs would be enthusiastically received by students and that various types of innovations would reflect unique strengths and weaknesses, they found:

> Our predictions were a disaster. Contrary to our expectations, we found that students do not participate in programs that permit them to plan their own education. Interdisciplinary and team-taught programs often fail because faculty do not want to teach them. When faculty do teach them, they are unable to integrate their disciplines or to work together. Written evaluations are also unsuccessful because faculty find them too burdensome, students are not interested in them, and graduate schools dislike them. Finally, student and faculty performance--whether in interdisciplinary and team-taught courses, student-centered curriculum, written evaluation grading, or any other structure--proved to be much the same in each program examined.[15]

The writers seem less optimistic than the reporter for U.S. News and World Report about the kind of reception innovations have received.

Excursus: Curriculum as System

We are getting ahead of our story. This monograph is designed as a report on trends. Before attempting further to generalize about trends we need to examine in a more systematic way what appear to be the major developments in curriculum at the mid-1970s. The reader then may draw such conclusions as seem appropriate. Before we begin this more orderly analysis, however, may we take a brief excursus. Levine and Weingart expressed disappointment that there were so few significant outcomes when they began to examine reported efforts at reform. One of the critical factors in this apparent lack of impact of curricular reform may lie in the failure of those involved to have a broad enough conception of what is involved in curricular change. Joseph Axelrod earlier observed this same apparent lack of impact of efforts at change and concluded that the end of the story in much of reform is everywhere the same, that "reforms are instituted and all too often do not seem to 'take.'"[16]

As he reflected on the many failures, it seemed to him that there was altogether too little recognition given to the curricular-instructional process as a system. He states that, "we cannot change only one element in the system in any substantial way and expect the change to 'take.' There is a certain reciprocity between each element in the system and all of the other elements...and before we can successfully reform one aspect of the process we must understand profoundly the connections between it and the other elements in the system." A framework or model for demonstrating the interrelationships includes six elements: contents, schedule, certification, group/person interaction, student experience, freedom/control. The first three elements are structural in that they refer to specific elements determined by the faculty. The second three elements are implemental, in that they are conditions under which the first three elements may operate. The interrelationship is suggested in the diagram below.

--and ELEMENT	Interrelationships between ELEMENT					
	I CONTENT	II SCHEDULE	III CERTIFICATION	IV INTERACTION	V EXPERIENCE	VI FREEDOM
I CONTENT		1	2	3	4	5
II SCHEDULE	1		6	7	8	9
III CERTIFICATION	2	6		10	11	12
IV INTERACTION	3	7	10		13	14
V EXPERIENCE	4	8	11	13		15
VI FREEDOM	5	9	12	14	15	

Axelrod has further noted that in the relationship between any one element and any of the other elements, certain questions are generated. He indicates a potential of fifteen different kinds of questions. By way of illustration he notes how a schedule system (II) may limit possible developments in content (I). A liberal arts college had undertaken to introduce a new kind of freshman composition course, but after a year of effort the plan was not working as it should. The new plan called for a combination of different class periods such as thirty-minute sessions for certain purposes, three-hour sessions for other purposes and variations between. The Department of English, responsible for implementing the plan, was accustomed to three periods of fifty minutes, three times per week. The new plan also required several different kinds of meeting-places. Without the college having made adequate preparation for scheduling in time and place, the content of the proposed course simply could not be adequately developed. (Colorado College in introducing the course module system initially found unanticipated problems of a similar sort and involving space and time scheduling. The College has, with some adjustments, been able through subsequent planning to meet these particular difficulties.)

What is intended at this point is simply to emphasize that changing curriculum involves more than effecting variations in content of particular courses. Curriculum involves the sum total of experiences afforded the student in the pursuit of his educational objectives. Content is related to scheduling, both of these in turn are related to certification, i.e. the manner in which work performed is evaluated. Critical elements are: the way in which individuals may interact with the group, the kind of background the students bring to the situation, the degree of freedom and control that operates within the system. An isolated change often has a short life, because the broader context or system within which the change is undertaken may not have been sufficiently taken into account to provide support for the particular change.

Categories for Reviewing Trends

Much of the current literature about instructional programs--we are using "curriculum" and "instructional programs" synonomously--falls within the context of discussions about, or reports on, "change," "innovation," or "non-traditional" education, and one is tempted to conclude that if there are any identifiable trends, they are somehow toward change, innovation and the non-traditional. As we have already observed, however, the "new" is seldom new in the sense that it has never appeared in the same or similar form before.[17] In the words of the Preacher: "The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun."[18] Yet there are shifts in emphasis and modifications and different combinations of elements--all of which may constitute change.

Rather than debate whether what is happening is new or different or evidence of change, we propose in the pages that follow simply to report what is being written about curriculum and leave it to the reader to make judgments about degrees or kinds of change. Similarly, when we refer to "trends" we are not prepared to debate over how much of a trend, how long a trend or whether it is a "real" trend. Where possible we try to compare program elements over a span of time. In most cases we can only describe what observers report to be current activities.

Trends as such are difficult to establish. Reports are not equally useful, and data are often not directly comparable. We must depend upon other summaries, such as those of Heiss,[19] Creager,[20] Hodgkinson,[21] staff studies for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, individual studies and unpublished material. The preparation of the annotated bibliography on non-traditional education by William Mahler illustrates something of the problems involved in locating usable sources.[22]

Mahler used the personal files of staff members of the Commission on Non-Traditional Study, materials from persons interviewed for the project and the files of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). He found more than 10,000 possibly useful references in the ERIC files, reviewed 1,755 abstracts, and reduced the annotations to 173 basic references. There appears to be a good bit of innovation underway, but definitive reports are not always available or accessible. The summaries that follow make no pretense at being as complete or exhaustive. We are frankly emphasizing sources that are generally accessible. The "Notes" will identify the sources and provide the reader with specific citations that can be examined in more detail.

To organize the review of courses one needs some kind of structure. Recent studies of curriculum innovation and change suggest possible structures. Ann Heiss' comprehensive review of academic innovation and reform presents findings under five categories: new innovative institutions, institutions within institutions, innovative changes by academic subunits within conventional colleges and universities, procedural innovation and institutional self-studies. Levine and Weingart report their findings under eight headings: current undergraduate programs, advising, general education, comprehensive examinations and senior year, concentration, alternatives to departments, student-centered curriculum, grading. The Commission on Non-Traditional Study suggests three categories: broadening opportunities, reshaping institutions, examining alternatives. Axelrod's suggested model for the analysis of curriculum change uses six elements: content, schedule, certification, group/person interaction, student experience, freedom/control. There are many other variations.

One of the more comprehensive approaches to curricular change is that of JB Lon Hefferlin. In the book, The Dynamics of Academic Reform he reports on a four-year study that draws upon some 16 in-depth case studies of institutions undergoing change and upon a general survey of 110 colleges representing a stratified random sample of American colleges.[23] He isolates three kinds of response that have resulted in new programs. The first is to create new institutions; if the old institutions do not accomplish what is required, new ones may be created. A second approach is to change or transform existing institutions. The third, and the most frequently found approach, is to change through "accretion" and "attrition." By accretion, an institution adds new programs or emphases, and by attrition, an institution drops programs or emphases.

With some modification, we shall employ the structure suggested by Hefferlin, and the specific reforms or innovations discussed in reports currently available can be placed in one or another of these three broad categories.

New Institutions

The first type of response noted by Hefferlin is the creation of new institutions. If existing institutions do not accomplish what someone or some group desires, then new institutions are established. In the fall of 1973 the Chronicle of Higher Education reported on openings and closings of American higher educational institutions. In spite of the number of institutions that had closed or merged with other institutions, there were more institutions that had either come into existence as new institutions or through the merger with other institutions.[24] There were 85 openings and only 31 closings. With all of the financial and other pressures on higher educational institutions, it is surprising that during the last few years we have continued to experience this net increase in institutions, although not all of the new institutions are responses to pressure for change, and not all of them can by any means be referred to as "innovative" or "experimental."

When Lewis Mayhew described the new colleges for the volume Higher Education: Some Newer Developments in 1965, he used as specific examples the University of South Florida, Monteith College of Wayne State University, New College at Hofstra, Oakland University, Florida Presbyterian College, St. Andrews College and referred also to Santa Cruz of the University of California, Chicago Teachers College-North, Grand Valley State College, New College at Sarasota, Florida Atlantic University. He noted in the introduction to his article that during the period from 1961-1964 a total of 146 new colleges and universities had been established in the United States.

Strictly speaking, not all of the institutions reviewed by Mayhew were "new" colleges. Monteith College was created as a special unit within a large university, and New College at Hofstra as a one-year program in an existing institution. St. Andrews College came out of the consolidation of three existing institutions. The others constituted new foundations without antecedent bodies, although Oakland was created as a new unit in a new geographical location of Michigan State University. The College of Basic Studies of the University of South Florida, Monteith College, Florida Presbyterian College and St. Andrews College took new approaches or new variations to the general education component of undergraduate education.

Mayhew summarizes in his article the main emphases of the new institutions:

> These new institutions demonstrate several new or renewed trends in higher education. First, they generally reflect a desire on the part of educators to capture some of the educational potential of the small colleges without yielding the undoubted virtue of large size. Thus Monteith, New College at Hofstra, Santa Cruz, the University of the Pacific, and Michigan State have all been attracted to the college-within-a-college concept....Related to this quest for integrity through size is the equally prominent search for integrity through curriculum. Each one of these new colleges is seeking, through some variant of the liberal arts or general education curriculum, insurance against undue specialization or

> fragmentation of educational experience....A number of new colleges are giving major attention to the use of automated instruction, tapes, and the like to enrich instruction and to make it more economical....In contrast to the recent trend toward elitism in higher education, these new colleges, with few exceptions, seem to be based on a moderate theory. They want to attract well-prepared, able students, but they are not searching for only the top few from the ability range....This same interest in good-average students is involved in the general preoccupation with variants of independent study.... These colleges seem to be saying that the same techniques that worked with honor students can be made to work with a cross-section of the student population....(and) each of these new institutions has sought deliberately to create a feeling of an intellectual community.[25]

He goes on to indicate that most of the new colleges are also conscious of the need to keep the curriculum "within safe and economical bounds"; several were experimenting with large instructional groups and with other than the typical departmental organization. He also noted that "in one way or another these colleges are seeking to emphasize internationalism" through area studies, centers for the study of other cultures, research abroad, and language study.

Among the problems Mayhew noted was a major one of recruiting faculty who could adapt to the ideas incorporated into the plans for the new colleges. And although the colleges emphasized in their establishment the primary place of the liberal arts and sciences, pressures for vocational courses soon appeared. Efforts to maintain other than departmental organization faced constant pressure from faculty who were more departmentally oriented than they might have thought at first. Mayhew also noted how difficult it was to maintain flexibility in institutions that began with great amounts of flexibility. It was all too easy to transform into difficult-to-change patterns the very aspects that began as innovative or experimental activities. He also found that the programs of the newer institutions appeared to be more the result of an eclectic process than as an outgrowth of a particular consistent theory or philosophy.

Since the publication of the article in 1965, New College in Sarasota Florida has faced difficulties and in May, 1974, offered to become a branch of a state system.[26] Subsequently, the state agreed to purchase the college and will incorporate it into the University of South Florida. Florida Presbyterian College has become Eckerd College, and Oakland has grown into a major university in its own right.

Oakland and Monteith were the subject of a report by David Riesman, Joseph Gusfield and Zelda Gamson.[27] The three began interviewing faculty and administrators at the two colleges in 1960, when both Monteith and Oakland had been in existence for one year. Their report carries the development through the mid-1960s. As the writers viewed the two institutions, Monteith College appeared to them to represent "a late dedication to the General Education movement;" the dominant group within the social science faculty of Monteith had been influenced by the University of Chicago general education college. The initial Oakland faculty had no particular academic model, but many admired the curricular and the academic intensity of such elite liberal arts colleges as Columbia, Oberlin, Swarthmore, Wesleyan--all primarily residential institutions. They found in the aspirations of the two new colleges "an element of revivalism, both in an effort to return to plain living without frills and in a perfectionist hope that a mass of unselected students might somehow be redeemed."[28] Monteith was viewed as an experimental institution, while Oakland was initially planned to become "a full-fledged university in an area previously without any institutions of public higher education. It was intended by its Michigan State University founders to be distinguished rather than distinctive."[29] Monteith, in particular, worked against the traditional departmental organization, and the curriculum was designed to consist of three sequences which would account for about half of the student's program during the first two years, one-quarter in the junior year, and one-half in the senior year.

As one reads the Riesman report, while appreciating the great amount of effort that has gone into developing the two institutions, one comes away with the feeling that significant innovation is hard to come by. The comments of the three interviewers regarding the faculty at the two institutions are particularly noteworthy:

> Again and again in our interviews, faculty said that they were attracted by the opportunity to build a program different from the conventional one. Yet when we drew them out as to the nature of their proposals, they often expressed only marginal differences from prevailing models--differences, in fact, shared by many young specialists in their branch of the discipline....On the whole, /faculty members/ saw themselves as engaged in a mopping-up operation against methodological backwardness and fuzzy, unsupported thinking, carrying on the mission of influential mentors from graduate school.[30]

Both colleges were dedicated to developing new approaches to a curriculum for commuter students, but the writers observed:

> The problems of creating a curriculum for commuter students that will neither ignore nor cater to their limitations are hardly better understood now than they were when Oakland and Monteith began. Moreover, the institutional mechanisms for providing career lines for faculty who want to focus on issues of teaching and learning have yet to be devised.[31]

Differences in the academic atmospheres in the two institutions were observed. The writers found Oakland's atmosphere "like that of a hotel or an apartment house whose guests or tenants are expected to be polite but not particularly neighborly," while on the other hand, they found Monteith "more like a family, where privacy of office and classroom hardly existed." Oakland in the late 1960s had developed a broader clientele, was becoming a university of a cluster-college type, and had moved considerably beyond the general purpose institution it represented at its founding. Monteith was characterized as "an experiment stabilized." It lost its special status in 1964 when the grant for its founding provided by the Ford Foundation was exhausted, but it still operates as a unit within the larger university, and it has secured tenure for several of its faculty members and retains its emphasis on teaching and curricular development, upon general education and independent study.

When Ann Heiss describes the new institutions, she includes among the group New College at Sarasota, the University of South Florida, Oakland and Florida Presbyterian College, all referred to by Lewis Mayhew in his earlier article.[32] In addition, she takes note of Evergreen State College in Washington, Federal City College, Hampshire College, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, Antioch College at Columbia, Maryland, Thomas Jefferson College in Allendale, Michigan, New York State University College at Old Westbury, Friends World College, Prescott College and the State University of New York at Purchase. Other examples include the University of California at Santa Cruz and San Diego (the first one is mentioned in Mayhew's article), Nova University, the College of the Potomac, the Learning Community in Portland, Oregon, and Antioch West, San Francisco.

New College in Sarasota, in spite of the May 1974 announcement is revealed in 1972-73 as a thriving institution, with its emphasis upon a curriculum grouped under the three divisions of the natural sciences, social sciences and non-sciences with each division focusing upon interdisciplinary courses as well as providing "areas of study" that reflect the more traditional departmental offerings. Students could elect to work for the baccalaureate in three or four years, the basic difference being in how the Independent Study projects are completed; all students are in residence for nine terms and all students must also undertake a series of independent study projects. Students, in addition, have the option of a contractural or non-contractural program; in the former the student develops term by term, in consultation with two faculty members, his own sequence of courses.[33]

The University of South Florida is reported in 1972-73 as placing a heavy emphasis upon general education. Students take one-third of their program in general education studies with a heavy emphasis on interdisciplinary and independent study methods. The emphasis in the original unit of Oakland University on general education is reported to be continuing, with some 48 credit hours extended over a four-year program, but the developments of the other two units of the University are not noted.

Florida Presbyterian College (Eckerd College) continues in 1971-72 to emphasize independent study, and as much as 60 percent of the degree requirements can be taken in the form of independent study. During each of the four years, however, each student also enrolls in an interdisciplinary core course. One of the pioneers in the recent development of the interim, Eckerd College has developed a variety of learning opportunities in the winter term under the 4-1-4 calendar.[34]

Evergreen State College presents the student with two options for planning a general education program, a Coordinated Studies Program in which the student selects from a number of interdisciplinary topics, and a Contracted Studies Program that is based on self-paced learning and the student's own individual interest. A report prepared by the Council on Higher Education of the State of Washington emphasizes the "experimental" dimension, and directs attention to the Career-Learning Experiences and Service Learning Experiences; the former are most often arranged as Contracted Studies and include various types of training internships, while the latter are normally a part of the Coordinated Studies and involve field placement in service agencies such as Head Start, hospitals and Community Action programs. Instead of taking four or five courses, the student is to concentrate on one coherent program at a time.[35]

Hampshire College, founded as an experimental college by the Five-College Consortium in Massachusetts likewise places heavy emphasis upon individualized programming. Students are to devise their own program, make up their own tests, and pace their own degree progress. The planning for Hampshire was detailed in such early publications as The Making of a College.[36] Sponsored by Amherst, Mount Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts, the College opened in the fall of 1970. Commenting on the development three months after opening date, John Walsh takes note of the 4-1-4 calendar, the three-course student load and the heavy stress on students "proving themselves able to pursue independent study.../since/ it is really on the ability of the students to work independently that the concept of controlling the size of the faculty without sacrificing educational quality depends."[37] Visiting the College in 1973, one researcher discovered that faculty found teaching loads heavy, that students were seeking advice and consultation much more than expected, and that faculty in doing many things for the first time--such as developing new courses and interdisciplinary projects--gave much more time to study and preparation than they had anticipated.[38]

Two members of the first class of Hampshire College joined writing a review of their experiences at Hampshire, in the course of which they pinpoint a number of issues that face every experimental college. First of all, how different can an experimental college be:

> Can it continue to innovate each year? The difficulty in answering these questions is rooted in a lack of clarity regarding the purpose of the school's innovations. Does Hampshire, while being innovative, intend to serve the same intellectual and social objectives as conventional schools? Or is it to explore new goals, new definitions of the educated person, and perhaps even new social values? If the latter purpose is to be served by the college, there is room for constant reevaluation and experimentation. If the college's purpose, however, is to meet the same goals as its neighboring institutions but to do so in a different way, experimentation undoubtedly will be curbed.[39]

Hampshire has apparently, as is suggested in the recent catalog, opted for a middle-of-the-road stance, to be neither radical nor conservative. The students found this lack of clarity a source of "an inconsistency of educational practice and direction which has been a source of frustration for students and faculty alike."

The college is organized around four multidisciplinary schools, and this structure was employed to avoid the exclusiveness of the more typical collegiate departmental organization. Where students asked for an Educational Studies program that required resources from several of the schools, the new interschool program was established, but because virtually all of the faculty are assigned to the four schools, interschool programs have a hard time surviving. The students observe:

> ...the schools have very quickly become as rigid and protective as traditional departments. And to each school has accrued a larger proportion of the political and economic power than a department has had in any other college. Quickly falling back on the political and intellectual models with which they are familiar, faculty members at Hampshire have used the schools as substitutes rather than as alternatives to departments.[40]

The writers also note that faculty are not only prone to fall back on accustomed patterns of organization, but they find it difficult to develop new instructional procedures; faculty are trained in conventional institutions and are "steeped in the conventional processes and rationales of liberal education." The students also, by and large, do not come equipped with the skills for dealing with the kind of freedom Hampshire wants to foster.

Hampshire is an experimental college, and it should, suggest the writers, seek to measure progress of students in less conventional ways, but the college "does compare its education to other institutions and /thus/ demonstrates...traditional concern in its transfer policy." They argue that the notion of transfer equivalency is not only illogical, it is also counterproductive.

Frustrated with what they view as compromises and fear of risk, the writers nonetheless end on a complimentary note:

> But as the first students at Hampshire College, we have been lucky. We've been able to teach courses, advise other students, design academic programs, and define curricular structures. We've learned how to learn, and we've gained intellectual confidence and humility. We hope the forces that push Hampshire into a more conventional mold can be resisted, so that the students who follow us can have experiences as fruitful and rewarding as ours.[41]

One turns from the article with a bittersweet taste--how new and different and innovative can a college be and persist in a context that demands a certain measure of interchangeability?

Federal City College attempts to provide a diversified program for low-income groups. Antioch College in Columbia, Maryland seeks to involve students in wide participation in community action. The academic program is heavily individualized. The University of Wisconsin at Green Bay focuses on ecological relationships. Livingston College of New Jersey State University is an experimental urban-oriented college with an emphasis upon education for multiracial students.[42] Thomas Jefferson College in Michigan expouses students to experiences that "demand self-motivation, individual expression, personal and social responsibility, and independence." New York State University College at Old Westbury seeks to work with minority, part-time and older students. It offers external degree programs, "second chance" programs for older persons, external credit programs, and a variety of professional training programs. Friends World College emphasizes gaining first hand experience in other cultures. Prescott College is committed to interdisciplinary study and organizes its curriculum around five teaching certers--art and literature, contemporary civilization, man and his environment, the person, and systems and sciences. The State University of New York at Purchase emphasizes the arts, and the freshman program is largely an interdisciplinary study based on broad themes and topics.

If there is any general theme that runs through the colleges that Ann Heiss singles out for profiles, it is the emphasis upon individually developed courses and experiences. The colleges provide considerable freedom for students in developing their courses. Theme orientations are evident in ecology at the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay, intercultural experiences in Friends World College and the arts in the State University of New York at Purchase.

In 1967 the American Council on Education began a systematic inquiry into the development of new colleges in American higher education. The result was the publication in 1972 of a monograph that provides considerable information on 939 colleges founded between 1947 and 1967.[43] In the preface to the report it is noted that more than one-third of the 2,573 colleges and universities existing in 1970 had come into existence after 1947. Two-thirds were founded as two-year community colleges, and the others were four-year colleges and post-baccalaureate institutions. Over half, 55 percent, were under public auspices. It should be noted that 100 of the institutions founded during the survey period no longer existed in 1971.

On an average, over the 20-year period from 1947 to 1967, new institutions of higher education in the United States were founded at the rate of about 45 per year. The greatest growth was during 1965, when 110 new institutions, which 76 were public two-year colleges, came into existence. Of the 349 private colleges founded during this survey period, 156 were four-year institutions and 50 were post-baccalaureate. During the same 20-year period some 55 private four-year institutions were dropped from the USOE directory, and presumably went out of existence. Thirty-two of these had been established since 1947. Some 83 percent of the new four-year private institutions had enrollments in the fall of 1967 of less than 1,000 students, and only 17 percent enrolled between 1,000 and 4,999.

One gains little insight into the degree of which these new institutions are reviewed as experimental or innovative. Perhaps one indication that only a small proportion would be viewed as innovative is the one question in the questionnaire that dealt with the use of instructional technology. The presidents of these institutions are the respondents, and it is noted that the high percentage indicating only "moderate" and "little or no" utilization "probably reflect the teaching-as-usual preferences of most faculty members at their institutions.[44] Another indication of the limited degree to which these institutions might be characterized as innovative is the presidents' response to the question regarding the most important considerations in deciding to create a new institution. Only

40 percent of the presidents in the four-year institutions responded that the most important consideration was "demand for educational offering." Some two-thirds responded that the most important consideration was that adequate financing was assured.[45]

The inventory developed by Ann Heiss also refers to a number of innovative two-year colleges. As the ACE studies suggest, most of the new institutions established in the twenty-year period of time between 1947 and 1967 were two-year institutions. Among the innovative two-year institutions listed by Ann Heiss are Miami Dade Junior College in Florida, Simon's Rock College in Massachusetts, the College for Human Resources in New York, Navajo Community in Arizona, Delta College in Michigan, Nairobi College in California,[46] Loop College in Illinois, the College of San Mateo in California and the Labor College of Empire State College in New York.

Simon's Rock, although classified as a two-year college in An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform, characterizes itself as "a four-year residential liberal arts college open to young men and women of all races and creeds who have successfully completed 'college preparatory studies' through the tenth grade of high school."[47] The college grants the Associate in Arts degree, thus marking it as a four-year upper-secondary and freshman-sophomore collegiate institution. It seeks in the 120 semester hour program to provide a liberal education that provides "the student with a time for becoming acquainted with the whole range of human inquiry, a time for finding out about himself, the world in which he lives, and his heritage."[48] Only one course is required of all students (beginning in September 1973), and that is English Level 100. A Bachelor of Arts degree option is also under examination. The college is organized by divisions, but it lists courses also by departments.

Empire State College is discussed in a recent article in The Journal of General Education.[49] The authors refer to the 1972 Empire State Master Plan which calls for the new institution to be one which:

> transcends constraints of space, place and time....It will seek to transcend conventional academic structure which imposes required courses, set periods of time, and residential constraints of place upon the individual student. The College will utilize the variety of State resources available to higher education for students of all ages, according to their desires, interests and capacities. The University will rely on process, rather than structure of education to shape and give it substance as well as purpose.[50]

They point out that Empire State College "has its own president, faculty, and advisory council, but no fixed campus." The College works through "Regional Learning Centers," each headed by a Dean and responsible for developing programs in one of the eight regions so far established. These regional centers are charged with providing learning centers within commuting distance of those to be served. The learning centers are staffed by one, or more full-time mentors or counselors and such part-time faculty as are needed. Students develop their programs with a mentor, programs based on any or all of the following: independent study, tutorials, cooperative studies, self-study, direct experience, formal courses. The program decided upon is set out in a contract; a full-time contract assumes an investment of 36-40 hours per week, and a part-time contract calls for 18-20 hours a week. Again, although Ann Heiss lists Empire State as a two-year college, the College offers baccalaureate as well as associate degrees.

Reviewing the status of experimental colleges in an article in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Larry A. Van Dyne notes that while differing among themselves these colleges still have much in common in method, philosophy and even in their jargon. They have their own mimeographed newsletter, their "national resource center" and their own national conferences. And while all claim to be "historic departures from the norm," Van Dyne contends that "many in fact are not," that they have "precedents in other places or other times, and much of what they do is borrowed from A.S. Neill, John Dewey, and even Socrates."[51]

What is significant about the colleges, whether they are in large part newly developed departures or borrowers from the past is that "they approach educational reform in a comprehensive way, going far beyond tinkering with grading systems and other piecemeal reforms."[52] He summarizes the major "innovations" under three areas: instruction, living arrangements, governance. By and large they seek alternatives to distribution requirements, majors, grades, lectures and provide ways for students to develop their own approaches to learning. Carried to its logical extreme this means in some instances students "negotiate a wholly individualized contract spelling out the scope and content of all, or large parts, of their undergraduate experience." Not all students, however, are able to cope with the lack of structure and new freedom; they drop out or return to conventional programs. When structured, the instruction relies mainly on small seminars, independent study, and field work off campus. In living arrangements the experimental colleges seek for some kind of intimacy or "community" that brings students and faculty into "more frequent" and "less formal contact." In governance, efforts are directed toward widening participation in decision-making, "often giving each student and each faculty member one vote on important matters." The effort to extend participation often leads to "long hours in town meetings, discussing and deciding issues both big...and small," and the tendency for such meetings to "distintegrate into endless debates of the unsignificant has prompted some experiments to draw back from their early insistance that all issues be decided by everybody."[53]

Not every experiment is successful--if continued existence is a measure of success. Bensalem, an adjunct of Fordham University was "phased out." Black Mountain College, a much earlier experiment, closed its doors. Van Dyne suggests why the experiments are difficult to maintain. Faculty members, cut off from so many of the conventions of higher education--testing, grades, required courses, credit hours, office hours, calendars, classrooms and clocks and all the rest--experience considerable strain, and they face career risks as well. They can get out of step with the academic reward system, because they become turned off to publish-or-perish, fail to keep up with developments in their erstwhile specialty and lose status in their departments. The colleges face money problems too, in that many begin on "risk capital," are more costly than the "regular"units, and in times of financial stringency are more and more called upon to prove their worth. They are also concerned as experimental units about how to maintain freshness and remain experimental.

The latter issue was the focus of an investigation undertaken by a doctoral student at the University of Denver. By examining documents covering the development of the institutions and conducting wide-ranging on-site interviews at six experimental colleges--New College at Sarasota, Governors State College in Illinois, Hampshire College, Evergreen State College, Prescott College and the University of Wisconsin - Green Bay--Kunkel sought to determine how effective these institutions were in maintaining their initial orientation to experimentation in policies and practices.[54] He found a tendency to move to more formal and stable organizational structures, toward clearer definition of roles and functions. While non-departmental structure and non-graded systems were maintained both aspects seemed to be under constant threat. Kunkel found the interdisciplinary programming, a major feature in each institution, by and large surviving, but experiencing "considerable difficulty."

> First, there are demanding faculty workloads involved in working out newly formed interdisciplinary offerings. Second, there are the traditional tendencies of many faculty personnel in wanting to devote much of their time to their own disciplines....Third, there is the basic problem of getting diverse egos, both professional and personal, to blend their efforts into a single educational learning bloc--no easy task in itself. Then there is the added problem of monitoring this group through the use of poorly organized, administratively chaotic centers or divisions.[55]

He also found the independent study features, while maintained, were "threatened constantly by both faculty and student factors." And his general observation is "The most influential general factor in opposing the development of innovative educational environments is the traditionalism of the attitudes and beliefs of the constituents of the innovative institutions...." In short, the internal parties--faculty, students, administration--generally prove to be their own worst enemies.

Van Dyne's review noted the pressures being put on experimental colleges to provide evidence of their uniqueness, to show why they should be maintained. Robert Brown suggests that the key questions in any evaluation of experimental colleges are: "Should experimental colleges be evaluated? What form should evaluation take? How does selectivity affect evaluative efforts? What are some of the technical problems facing evaluators of experimental colleges?"[56] The answer to the first question, he suggests, is a clear affirmative. Evaluation is needed "to facilitate decision-making about a program by providing data-based conclusions about the worth of various dimensions of the program and to stimulate hypotheses and suggestions about productive changes in it."[57] Any evaluation must be of a comprehensive nature and Brown suggests that a four- or five-year period involving a planned series of mini-evaluations is a useful model. The selectivity problem--students in such programs are largely self-selected--poses some serious problems for evaluation. Experimental colleges need experimental and innovative evaluation procedures. A simplistic input-output model will be ineffective.

- 0 -

We have attempted to present an overview of the new colleges. The overview is just that; it is not a complete treatment, but the intent has been to be illustrative rather than exhaustive. Articles, reviews and studies relating to the new colleges appear with some regularity. Much of the literature takes the form of impressionistic reports on one or a small group of programs; definitive studies are yet to be undertaken. One gains the impression of much activity and of the hope for some "breakthrough" in collegiate education. The reviewer is sobered, however, by the observations of Bloch and Nylen on the first years of Hampshire College.[58] Paul Dressel is even less sanguine about the potential for significant change:

> Innovation in education has too frequently been a leap from one rigidity to another and ultimately equally rigid pattern, for any attempt to achieve complete flexibility leads to chaos and to the imposition of some type of structure. Unless that structure is provided by a statement of objectives so that flexibility in the program is always examined and adjusted in relation to its effectiveness in achieving those goals the inevitable result is a retreat toward traditional patterns and practices. This, as I read it, is the history of innovation in American higher education.[59]

In his well-documented review of the development of upper-division colleges, Robert Altman reaches a not dissimilar conclusion, but he does so from a different perspective. Reflecting on the experience of the College of the Pacific which had launched one of the earlier attempts at a junior-senior college, Altman comments:

> The College of the Pacific had eventually discovered what many other experimental programs involving the structure of education had discovered: that a single institution, regardless of the degree to which it is internally satisfied with an organizational structure different from that of those institutions with which it interacts, cannot continue to operate under those conditions if the other institutions (or accrediting bodies or athletic conferences) do not make certain necessary adjustments.[60]

One is tempted to incorporate this statement into a form of "Altman's Law," so universal does its application seem to be. Even the College Program of the

University of Chicago with its demonstrated success in areas important to the faculty of the College succumbed.

A group of institutions to which no reference has been made in the preceding review of new colleges is that small collection of what Altman calls the "Upper Division College." We commend Altman's volume to the reader. One will find that as with other "innovations" the upper division college is rooted in the past, in proposals of such leaders as Wayland at Brown and Tappan at Michigan. The University of Georgia even launched a short-lived upper division program prior to the Civil War. The more recent efforts of the College of the Pacific, the University of Chicago, the New School Senior College in New York, Concordia Senior College, Flint and Dearborn Colleges, Florida Atlantic, the University of West Florida, Pratt Senior College and the Capitol Campus of Pennsylvania State are fully examined, and the problems and failures as well as the successes are well documented. To these should be added Governors State University and Sangamon State University in Illinois.

There are a number of directories describing in more or less detail the new colleges as well as other innovative and experimental programs. John Coyne and Tom Hebert have compiled what they subtitle "A Guide to Alternatives to Traditional College Education in the United States, Europe and the Third World."[61] While it begins with a chatty orientation to college-going with advice on buying everything from typewriters to used VW's, it also contains descriptions of well-known and not-so-well-known experimental colleges. A number of the entries are based on impressions gained during visits of the authors to campuses. In all, 100 colleges in the United States are described, and the listing contains institutions that do not appear in many other references. Another section contains information about foreign study opportunities.

A team of four have produced a Guide to Alternative Colleges and Universities.[62] This volume lists over 250 "innovative programs," and provides a brief write-up of each. Again, a number of the institutions were visited by one or more of the authors, although much of the information was secured by phone. Most of the colleges listed are not new colleges, but they are institutions in which in the perspective of the authors some innovative program is underway. The entries range from the University of Alabama to Western Washington State College with its College of Ethnic Studies and cover campus-based B.A. programs, two-year A.A. programs, external degree programs, special programs and a small sample (four) of the free universities.

Transformation of Existing Institutions

Under this heading we include reorganized colleges, "colleges-within-colleges," and cluster colleges. The latter two types of programs are included, because the presence of programs extensive enough to constitute a "college-within-a-college" or another cluster college are likely to have significant impact on the parent college, an impact sufficient to transform aspects of the parent college. In grouping these three program structures together, however, we recognize that we are faced with the classification problem that plagues so much of the writing about innovation in instructional programs and/or changes in curriculum. There are few standards or accepted conventions for listing and describing institutional programs. Strictly speaking, Monteith College, mentioned earlier in this report as a "new" college should be viewed as a college-within-a-college as should the New College at Hofstra and Raymond, Elbert Covell and Callison Colleges of the University of the Pacific, all three of the latter institutions discussed in the 1965 report by Lewis Mayhew on "new" Colleges. Two institutions listed in Heiss' study as new institutions, Kalamazoo College and Alice Lloyd College are not new colleges, but they are institutions that have in significant ways transformed or extended their programs. Until we have developed some more widely accepted nomenclature--and that seems a remote possibility, given the present state of the art of curriculum study--we are often going to find the same program described under quite different categories by different writers.

Accepting the present confusion in nomenclature, we shall with minimal apology proceed with our description of programs, sometimes discussing a particular program under more than one category, and in so doing we merely reflect the literature from which we draw the illustrations.

As examples of the transformation of institutions, Hefferlin draws from history the references to the change in Brown University in 1850, Antioch in 1921 and St. John's in 1937, as well as Parsons in 1955. In each of these instances, an existing program was set aside and a new model was instituted. Francis Wayland was able to bring about significant changes in Brown. In 1919 Antioch College had almost reached the stage of closing, graduating fewer than a dozen students a year, and the trustees tried to give it away to the YMCA, but the YMCA rejected the offer. Arthur Morgan, one of the trustees, then became president and introduced his idea of cooperative education. St. John's College was at the point of bankruptcy in 1937 but Stringfellow Barr and Scott Buchanan quite literally created a new institution based upon 120 classics as the new curriculum. Millard Roberts took small, denominational Parsons College and catapulted it to the front page with his new funding and instructional theories. For a period of time Parsons was one of the most talked-about colleges in the country, but some of Roberts' ways of manipulating the funds and the institution ultimately led to the destruction of the college; Parsons closed in 1974.

More recently, by adapting certain new elements Beloit, Kalamazoo, Goshen and Colorado College show how changing one element may influence the whole institution. Beloit College adopted a new calendar, a combination of on- and off-campus work and in so doing virtually created a new institution. Kalamazoo took the calendar revision a step further and built in a significant component of study abroad. Goshen College in Indiana, a small Mennonite college, introduced in the late 1960s a Study Service Term that has had profound implications for the entire structure of the institution. Colorado College was "transformed" when it moved into its modular programming. Courses had to be reconstituted, teaching methods had to be changed, and the pattern of life for students and faculty was altered significantly.

Are Beloit, Kalamazoo, Goshen and Colorado College "transformed" colleges? While the changes were primarily in calendar, at this stage in the development both Beloit and Kalamazoo would seem to be fully as "transformed" as Antioch was with the introduction of the cooperative study program. To our way of thinking they deserve the label "transformed." In similar manner, Goshen College, although it would probably not refer to itself as a "transformed" college has taken on significant new characteristics with the introduction of the Study Service Term. The Study Service Term calls for each student, during the sophomore year, to be involved in a trimester away from the campus and in a developing country. Units have gone to Central America, the Caribbean and South America. In recent graduating classes, over 95 percent of the students have participated in such programs. The college is attempting in a conscious way to incorporate the experiences of the trimester abroad into the life of the campus. With so many students having participated in a particular kind of off-campus experience, the campus itself over a period of time becomes transformed. More recently Goshen has also reexamined its total curriculum with special attention to the general education or liberal studies aspect.[63]

The dean of Colorado College, in a brief report during the third year of the new program, refers to the structural change as having "enormous impact on the academic life of the College." Courses are offered one at a time, in nine blocks, each three-and-a-half weeks in length. Each block is separated by four-and-a-half days beginning on Wednesday noon and ending the following Monday. The essential feature of the program is a block course of three-and-a-half weeks. Faculty and students normally are involved in only one course at a time. Scheduling of class meetings is variable; on some days the class may meet for two to three hours, or the class may not meet at all, or small groups may meet in tutorials or conferences. Each course has its own room available for classes and study. An evaluation during the second year revealed that 90 percent of the students and 73 percent of the faculty preferred the new structure. Class attendance has risen, suspensions for academic failure have dropped and the number of interdisciplinary courses has increased.

The format for teaching, grading, class interaction at Colorado College has changed in significant ways in many of the units. The dean concludes that the new structure has encouraged "more varied and effective pedagogy." There are gains and losses. It appears that the single course system "makes it somewhat more difficult to impart comprehensive factual knowledge," but the dean is of the opinion that there have been gains in developing the desire to learn, developing critical tools of thinking. He finds that "students are more eager to learn and their intellectual sophistication is greater." A longer term evaluation remains to be undertaken, but there seems little question that Colorado College, even with its select student body and long-time academic reputation, is a "transformed" college.[64]

While Ann Heiss refers to Alice Lloyd College in Pippa Passes, Kentucky as a new college, perhaps it is more of a transformed college. Established for service to the young people of Appalachia, it has effectively developed its outreach to incorporate an extensive community-service program in which one-sixth of the students spend their summers plus two weekends a month during the school year living and working in remote regions of Appalachia. It is this outreach program that brings to bear upon an institution which already had a unique purpose a new ingredient that would probably qualify Alice Lloyd College to be called a "transformed" college.

There are colleges other than Kalamazoo, Beloit, Goshen, Colorado College and Alice Lloyd that have been "transformed." From a previous period of time, and still continuing are such institutions as St. John's College and Antioch College.[65] These two colleges are "established" in their transformations.

What all of these transformed colleges have in common is that an existing institution, more or less traditional, has through the introduction of a significant change in calendar, or instructional technique, or program experienced more than a simple addition in programming. The college as a whole has been influenced by the introduction of the new element, and the environment of the college has been sufficiently changed to make it a new kind of enterprise.

That not all transformations "take" and not all those that do take are viewed as unqualified successes is suggested by Harvey Shapiro in his review of a series of essays on Antioch-Putney, Bensalem College of Fordham; Fairhaven College of Western Washington State, Old Westbury and Franconia. Less than enthusiastic about the outcomes of the experimental institutions and programs discussed, Shapiro concludes:

> If some of the essays reflect the fuzziness, romanticism, and half-digested psychology that motivated educational reform in the sixties, the book's last chapter, inevitably called 'meditation', echoes another common theme: like the reformers they depict, many of the authors have gone on to other interests....Having set out for utopia and been washed ashore, many of the experimenters have given up, masking their retreat in a dust cloud of rhetoric about getting in touch with their bodies and getting their heads together. D.W. Brogan once noted that Americans are notoriously short-term crusaders, and nowhere does that seem more accurate than on the nation's university campuses, where the population is transient and the attention span even more so.[66]

The College-Within-a-College.--Because the introduction of a new element can lead to the transformation of the college as a whole, we include in this section a brief review of units that have come to be labeled as a "college within a college." Few of the listings available manage to include all such institutions, and the list that follows, although it appears to be more extensive than others that we have yet discovered, undoubtedly fails to include all of the programs underway. When we refer to a "college within a college" we are referring to a discrete program with an identifiable faculty and an identifiable student body. While faculty and students may also participate in other work in the parent college, they can be clearly identified with the college within a college, and faculty usually devote most of their teaching effort to that special unit. In most cases also the college within a college has budgetary and administrative support.

Some of the programs listed below are just underway, while others have "matured" to the extent to which they have become accepted administrative units within an institution. Some are experimental in the sense that they may be phased out or are in the process of being phased out as some of the lessons learned are either incorporated into the parent college or discarded as non-productive--or if the efforts have not been characterized as "non-productive," at least they have failed to capture the interest and enthusiasm of the faculty as a whole. For example, the Experimental College at the University of Wisconsin in the early 1920s, although by its own measures a success and one that excited the enthusiasm and support of both faculty and students, went out of existence, because of lack of support among the faculty of the parent college of arts. Similarly, the four-year unified College of the University of Chicago, although it enjoyed a long history, went out of existence in 1957-58 as a separate unit because of active opposition on the part of faculty within the Divisions. While elements of the College remain as part of the undergraduate experience of students at the University of Chicago, the administrative degree-granting unit no longer exists.

The list that follows includes colleges within colleges that are either in existence at the present time or have only recently gone out of existence. Bensalem, included in the list, is an example of the latter.

Monteith College
University of South Florida Basic College
New College at Hofstra
New College, University of Hawaii
New College, Nasson College
New College, University of Alabama
New College, San Jose State University
The Experimental College at Berkeley (The so-called Tussman College)
The Residential Colleges of Michigan State University (Lyman Briggs, James Madison, Justin Morrill)
The Residential College at the University of Michigan
Johnston College of Redlands
Tuft's Experimental or "College Within"
Hutchins School of Liberal Studies of California State College, Sonoma
The Experimental College of Dartmouth
The Experimental College of California State, San Francisco
Fairhaven and Huxley Colleges, Western Washington State University at Bellingham
Centennial College of the University of Kansas, Lawrence
Christ College of Valpariso University
The Paracollege of Saint Olaf College
College III - University of Massachusetts, Boston
Project Ten - University of Massachusetts, Amherst
The College of Creative Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara
The Small College, California State College, Dominguez Hills
Bensalem College of Fordham

The last named college, Bensalem, lasted for six years. The first class of 30 students was carefully selected on the basis of intellectual and personal standards. The college was designed to be self-directive, liberal, self-evaluative. It was to operate on the basis of group consensus. One of the problems was that consensus was never easily arrived at, the self-selective nature of the college tended to isolate it from the rest of the university and finally it was terminated.

On the other hand, one of the more recently established units, the Paracollege at Saint Olaf, an undergraduate church-related college in Northfield, Minnesota, recently concluded its experimental period by being incorporated into the college as a separate unit. In 1968 the faculty of Saint Olaf College, in response to many of the same kinds of concerns that were surfacing on many campuses, authorized the establishment of what came to be called the Paracollege. The Paracollege was to provide opportunities for those who found the more conventional patterns of course requirements and course structure restrictive, or as some were wont to say, irrelevant. The new unit was established to be a part of the campus community in which any idea could be considered and could be put to the test. Implicit in the agreement to establish the Paracollege was the intention to incorporate into the main or regular college such procedures and practices as might prove desirable after trial in the Paracollege. In this way, the Paracollege was to be the initiating and innovating unit.

In the course of a special review during 1973-74 (the program had been under the continuing review of an office of evaluation established at the time that Paracollege was launched) the All-College Committee concluded that the college should be given the status of a continuing unit, on par with any other department or unit in the parent college. The "experiment" was judged a success and worthy of incorporation into the ongoing structure of Saint Olaf. Thus, instead of remaining the experimenting unit feeding new ideas into the regular college, Paracollege gained a life of its own as an alternate route for students admitted to Saint Olaf. What remains to be seen is what happens as the Paracollege, created as an experimental college, continues as an accepted part of the parent institution. Will it continue to be as inventive, as experimental, as innovative? Or, will the innovations become sufficiently accepted to give the Paracollege so much stability that it simply becomes another department or unit within the college. And, with the formal acceptance of the Paracollege into the parent college, where will the inventive and creative urge that helped create the institution find a place in the parent institution? How does an institution maintain this growing edge?

Project Ten at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst is another type of "college-within-a-college." It is a residential, living-learning experimental unit that almost closed down after the first two years of operation. In 1972 it was given a director and a new lease on life in the form of an additional five-year trial. During the first two years, "doing your own thing" apparently meant "turning on," and experimentation meant trying new drugs, and Karen Winkler, in reviewing the program, observed that, "As in other innovative programs trying to give students freedom to pursue their own educational goals, many of Project Ten's members drifted into confusion."[67] With Charles Adams as director, however, the project apparently has developed sufficient structure to gain faculty support for the extended trial period. Project Ten allows students to design their own programs for the first two years at the University. Half of their courses are usually from the regular university offerings and the other half may be selected from over 40 seminars given in the dormitory. The major stress is on the humanities, and the laboratory sciences have been virtually excluded. The project seeks applications from highly motivated students.

Cluster Colleges.--Ann Heiss offers a definition of the cluster college concept that makes a useful distinction not always observed in other references to cluster colleges. She writes, "Broadly defined, the cluster college concept is realized when a number of semi-autonomous colleges--either on the campus of a larger institution or in close proximity to each other--share, to a significant extent, faculties, and services."[68] This definition enables one to distinguish between the cluster colleges and the colleges-within-colleges, the former consisting of several more or less autonomous units, co-equal, but parts of an interrelated complex, and the latter designating a special unit, also more or less autonomous, but part of a larger institution. Jerry Gaff's otherwise very useful volume tends to combine the two concepts, although the term "subcollege" is usually applied to the college-within-a-college and the term "federated colleges" appears to be reserved for what Ann Heiss describes as the cluster college concept.[69]

In terms of Ann Heiss' definition, the following institutions would seem to qualify as cluster colleges:

- Claremont Colleges
  - Pomona College
  - Claremont Graduate School and University Center
  - Scripps College
  - Claremont Men's College
  - Harvey Mudd College
  - Pitzer College

- Atlanta University Center of Higher Education
  - Atlanta University
  - Morehouse College
  - Spelman College
  - Morris Brown College
  - Clark College
  - Interdenominational Theological Center

- University of the Pacific
  - Raymond College
  - Elbert Covell College
  - Callison College

- University of California, Santa Cruz
  - Cowell College
  - Stevenson College
  - Crown College
  - Merrill College
  - College Number Five

- Oakland University
  - Charter College
  - New College
  - Allport College

- Grand Valley State Colleges
  - College of Arts and Sciences
  - William James College
  - Thomas Jefferson College
  - College IV
  - F.E. Seidman Graduate College of Business

Such units as Justin Morrill, Lyman Briggs and James Madison at Michigan State University are more on the order of several colleges within a college as would be Revelle, Muir and Third College of the University of California at San Diego and Hutchins, the School of Expressive Arts and School of Environmental Studies at California State College, Sonoma. But the lines are never altogether clear, and

As Jerry Gaff reminds us, the cluster college concept is as old as Oxford and Cambridge. In the United States, however, the cluster college concept probably can be traced to the beginnings of the Claremont Colleges in 1925. The Claremont Colleges have developed as a federation of institutions, each unit maintains its independence but all share in certain educational resources. The Atlanta University Center of Higher Education began in 1929, and there was no further development of the cluster college concept until the University of the Pacific established Raymond College. The cluster college is thus a latecomer to the higher educational scene in the United States, and it still represents a very small segment of this scene. It is possible, however, that some expansion of colleges within a college in a particular location could develop into a cluster college. Gaff finds the existing cluster colleges "tend to be quite traditional, perhaps even reactionary" and "committed to the traditional values."[70] We think this judgment is perhaps too sweeping, particularly when one reviews such programs as the free-wheeling contract system at College IV of the Grand Valley State Colleges and the interdisciplinary and independent work in Raymond College of the University of the Pacific.

The cluster college concept would seem to provide an effective way of restoring collegiality to the complex universities and a way of renewal and perhaps survival for many small colleges. In the latter instances, however, because geographical proximity is a prerequisite, and few institutions are able to or prepared to change locations, few additional clusters of this type are likely to be developed. Large and complex universities may develop more subunits, but we do not see the cluster concept as the wave of the future.

Change by Accretion and/or Attrition

The response of the academy to pressures for change has taken the form of creating new institutions or of modifying old ones either through transforming an existing institution by the introduction of a new element or by establishing a new unit. And while it is not difficult to identify more than 25 new institutions that appear to have been instituted as innovative or experimental institutions, or to identify as many, or more, of the "college within a college" type, or even to identify a limited number of "transformed" colleges, the major developments in instructional programs have been more of the piecemeal type. While the outworn jest is frequently repeated that it is easier to move a cemetary than to change the curriculum, it will be seen that relatively few institutions have been untouched by some kind of change, be it limited or extensive, in the instructional program during the last decade. What is deceptive is that the basic stance of an institution, the established program, may not appear to have changed in significant ways, but departmental or program changes have been going on from year to year.

As Hefferlin observes, under normal circumstances, the major process of academic change is that of accretion and attrition, "the slow addition and subtraction of functions to existing structures." For, as Hefferlin points out, accretion and attrition are the most common means of change "primarily because they are the most simple."

> Unlike radical reform, they are small-scale, undramatic, and often unpublicized. By accretion an institution merely encompasses a new program along with the old--a new occupational course, a research project, a new undergraduate tradition. And through attrition, other programs and functions are abandoned, either because they become outdated--like compulsory chapel--or because they come to be performed by other institutions.71

It probably will be impossible ever to get an adequate inventory of these kinds of changes, simply because they are going on most of the time, are seldom reported outside the institution or outside of a small circle of persons acquainted with the institution, but let us examine some illustrations.

General Education.--In the first volume of the Report of The President's Commission on Higher Education issued late in 1947 the statement was made, "The crucial task of higher education today...is to provide a unified general education for American youth. Colleges must find the right relationship between specialized training on the one hand, aiming at a thousand different careers, and the transmission of a common cultural heritage toward a common citizenship on the other."[72] The report was addressed to the general theme of "Education for Free Men" and the authors had made the broad criticism that current college programs were not "contributing adequately to the quality of students' adult lives either as workers or as citizens." It contended that since the turn of the century the curriculum of the liberal arts colleges had been both expanding and disintegrating "to an astonishing degree" and as a consequence there was little sense of unity or direction within the curriculum. It observed that the trend was toward specialization and away from any sense of order or direction and contended that "the failure to provide any core of unity in the essential diversity of higher education is a cause for grave concern."

Some 60 years before, reacting to the elective system which had been developed under the leadership of Charles W. Eliot at Harvard, A. Lawrence Lowell, to become the president of Harvard at Eliot's retirement, was criticizing the lack of unity in the college curriculum. He observed that "for a score of years the college has been surrendering the selection of the studies to be pursued by undergraduates more and more into the hands of the students themselves..." and suggested the result was not unlike that of "a sick man in an apothecary's shop...moved to choose the medicine he required from the appearance of the bottles on the shelf."[73] He went on then to argue for some kind of compromise between specialization and what he referred to as "general education." Later, as president, in his annual report for 1908-1909, he noted that "the most significant movement during the year was that looking toward a modification of the elective system, and this resulted from an effort of much wider scope to improve the condition of scholarship among undergraduates." The move was toward providing the opportunity for the undergraduate to concentrate in one subject and while distributing the rest of his program widely "to require every student to make a choice of electives that will secure a systematic education, based on the principles of knowing a little of everything and something well."[74] Distribution was structured according to four general groups of subjects and every student was required to take something in each group. The four groups were the arts of expression--language, literature, fine arts and music; the natural and inductive sciences; the inductive social sciences--history, politics, and economics; the abstract or deductive studies--mathematics and philosophy, including law and diverse kinds of social theories.

The Cooperative Study in General Education, which continued between January 1939 and September 1944 with support from the General Education Board and sponsorship by the American Council on Education, involved some 25 colleges in an effort to bring about changes in general education programs, to develop a "broader and more realistic perspective of the problems of general education" and to provide opportunity for exchange of information on experimentation.[75] The final report of the study was issued the same year as that of the President's Commission on Higher Education and stated that the development of adequate programs of general education represented the crucial need in American higher education.

Two years before the President's Commission issued its report and the Cooperative Study published its findings, Harvard had issued General Education in a Free Society, a volume that became one of the more, if not most, often quoted sources for statements on general education during the last half of the 1940s. That report had stated that education has two functions. On the one hand it was to "help young persons fulfill the unique, particular functions in life which it is in them to fulfill," and on the other hand to "fit them so far as it can for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they will share with others."[76] After some fifty pages of analysis of the place of education in American society, the volume reiterated the position: "Our conclusion, then, is that the aim of education should be to prepare an individual to become an expert both in some particular vocation or art and in the general art of the free man and the citizen."[77]

It would not be too much of a generalization to say that the concern with general education in its various manifestations--and the term came to include an incredible variety of approaches--dominated curricular concerns in American higher educational institutions from the late 1930s through the 1950s. Russel Thomas in surveying curricular development from 1800 through 1960, began his review with the statement "For more than a quarter of a century general education has been a major concern of higher education in America. In its name curriculums have been reorganized, administrative structures of colleges have been altered, and countless workshops, conferences and self-study projects have been undertaken to the end that higher education might be improved. A forbidding volume of literature has been published on the subject."[78]

In June 1972, as it issued another in its volumes of reports and recommendations, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education suggested that one of the significant problem areas facing contemporary American higher education was "the collapse of general education into a potential or even actual disaster area." Elaborating upon the point made earlier in the volume, the Commission report stated:

> We regret the new tendency to relinquish concern for general education. It amounts to faculty abandonment of a sense of engagement in undergraduate educational policy. Some students protested the 'breadth' requirements, and some faculties that removed them have put nothing in their place. This does not demonstrate attention to student dissatisfactions, but, instead, a lack of interest in the general education of undergraduate students or lack of conviction about what should be done. Thus, at some colleges like Antioch, when the students were given an 'open' freshman year, many asked for more guidance--they felt bewildered and neglected.[79]

The report goes on to state that it is not advocating the return to some standard "breadth" requirement or a reinstatement of "survey" courses, but there is concern lest the intentions of general education be lost. It is even suggested that the term "general education" and "liberal education" as well be dropped, and it is proposed that the concept of "broad learning experience" be used instead. Education should be for breadth, to provide a person with:

> a chance to comprehend some major aspect of world cultures and human thought; the chance to get a wider perspective than the discipline or the individual elective provides; the chance to learn outside familiar paths, to absorb new points of view, to approach big problems and absorb data about them and to analyze them; a chance to expand the competence to think about new areas and to understand broad new situations; a chance, even, to discover some new interest that may lead to a new field of major concentration.[80]

And the way in which to provide such opportunities is to develop several options from among which students may choose and the report specifies as one of the recommendations, "consideration should be given to establishing campus by campus a series of coherent options for broad learning experience among which students may choose."[81] The concern for general education is reiterated in subsequent volumes of the Commission. The report on purposes and performance lists as first among the ways in which the campus can aid in the development of the students, assisting the student in "acquiring a general understanding of society and the place of the individual within it--this is the role of "general" education and it includes contact with history and with a nature of other cultures." Later on in the same report the Commission calls for making available to students "more broad learning experiences" and subsequently argues that higher education has "a fundamental obligation to preserve, transmit, and illuminate the wisdom of the past, to find, preserve and analyze the records of the past..."[82] The final report of the Commission calls for a "renovation of general education" and the provision of optional programs directed toward "broad learning experiences."[83]

And yet Joseph Axelrod and his colleagues, in discussing the failure of old models of curriculum, suggest that much of the confusion in the discussions of college curriculum "has risen out of the use of the terms breadth and depth." In making this criticism, they observe that the trends in curriculum since 1960 are toward stressing more the structural than the substantive aspects of knowledge. That is to say, the emphasis is less upon "covering" the content of a particular discipline and more on the process by which one comprehends within the discipline. They see as one of the signs of a trend a "return to the interdisciplinary course and the recommendation on many campuses that means be discovered for supporting such courses." They argue for a unity and suggest that "liberation from the conceptual trap of the breadth-depth framework can take place only as progress is made toward the discovery of a workable principle of unity for baccalaureate programs."[84] But in reaching this unity, they say the distinction between general and specialized studies, between liberal arts and professional education, between occupational and transfer curricula, are "false distinctions for today and certainly for tomorrow, however useful they might have been in some other world of the past." They find that new curriculum models involve breaking the wall down between the curriculum and the world outside, however slowly that is happening:

> In the new curriculum models...community involvement is not a part of the extracurriculum; it has been worked into the very fabric of course assignments. In urban institutions, the city itself is used in a systematic way as an educational laboratory.... We have elsewhere argued in some detail that courses built on such a principle ought to lead more directly to commonly accepted long-range educational goals than courses that are primarily book-centered and concept-oriented....In an ideal undergraduate curriculum, the great issues that concern us all, but which academic men rarely let creep into their courses, will become the major focus. Such a curriculum would emphasize the human problems that exist in the community where the young people live, and students would not be discouraged from going off-campus to look into such problems or even to engage in actions affecting them.[85]

But the hope for an ideal program is far from being achieved. Referring to an extensive survey of baccalaureate requirements carried out by the U.S. Office of Education, we find the writers noting that the survey shows that the dominant pattern is to have one-fourth of the requirements for the baccalaureate in major-field courses, about fifty percent in general education, and the remaining one-fourth in elective courses. Courses leading to a Bachelor of Science degree rather than the Bachelor of Arts degree tend to have somewhat larger requirements in the major subject and a reduction in the elective courses.

Paul Dressel and Frances DeLisle examined the course offerings of 322 institutions. They found that the prevailing pattern for general education was to designate between 31 and 40 percent of the total requirements for graduation as general education courses. Nearly 90 percent of the colleges were found within the range from 21 to 50 percent of the required courses. This was slightly higher than in 1957, when 82 percent of the colleges fell within this range. Within the general education requirements they found some slight variations over previous distributions, but the median percentage requirement for both periods was 37 percent.

This 37 percent could be broken down into 17 percent of the courses in the humanities, including English composition and speech, 10 percent in the natural sciences and mathematics and 10 percent in the social sciences.

Within the humanities almost 40 percent of the institutions were found to have specific requirements in English composition, literature, foreign languages, philosophy, and religion. The authors conclude that "there appears to be a reduction in the requirement of specific courses balanced by an increase in general distribution requirements so that the total requirement has remained unchanged. With regard to the natural sciences, the observation is that:

> most colleges and universities specify an undergraduate requirement in the natural sciences. The colleges not doing so are those which do not prescribe courses or credits in any area....The prevailing pattern is to require from five to ten percent of the total credits to be selected from the natural sciences. Usually about one-half of the work is to be taken in a laboratory science, but some colleges provide nonlaboratory courses and apparently accept these as fulfilling the requirement.[86]

In the social sciences over 90 percent of the colleges specify an undergraduate requirement. Within the requirement there seems to be a continuation of the traditional emphasis on the historical study of Western civilization. The writers found that "there has been essentially no change in the total requirements over the 10-year period among the institutions in the sample."[87]

Dwight R. Ladd reviewed changes in educational policy that took place during the 1960s at eleven institutions--University of California at Berkeley, the University of New Hampshire, the University of Toronto, Swarthmore College, Wesleyan University, Michigan State University, Duke University, Brown University, Stanford University, Columbia College, and the University of California at Los Angeles. He includes in the report of the study information about developments in some other institutions as well. With regard to general education, he observes that programs in general education have traditionally emphasized one or another approach, either a structured program "made up of specially designed core courses not defined to a single discipline" or "a distribution or breadth requirement built largely on regular departmental course offerings."[88] Among the institutions he surveyed, he found that only Columbia and Michigan State had continued with specially designed general education courses. Michigan State maintains a sequence of courses in the University College, the successor to the Basic College. The other institutions in the sample that Ladd examined maintained some form of distribution requirements. New Hampshire and Stanford combined a required course, "Introduction to Contemporary Civilization" and specified the other requirements under a distribution plan. As Ladd describes it:

> under the typical distribution requirement, the student took a certain number of courses in the traditional divisions of the curriculum--the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences--plus a course in English composition and a foreign language. The makeup of the divisions, the number of courses required, and other details vary, but the foregoing are characteristic of virtually all the requirements.[89]

In discussing the implications of the development, Ladd notes that Daniel Bell seems to be alone in proposing an increase in the general education requirements. In the reports from the institutions that Ladd surveyed, in all of the other cases except one, the report generally proposed a reduction in the number and range of courses required.[90]

It is interesting to observe that during 1973-74 Columbia had undertaken a revision of the general education program, characterized as the "first reform of its general-education curriculum since 1919." The new structure apparently has fewer specific requirements and a wider range of options. The structure as it is emerging consists of a weekly seminar open to everyone in the university, the intent of which, is "to evaluate past humanities courses and to discuss new interdisciplinary ones that would mix...undergraduate and graduate students," together with a series of smaller seminars within the professional schools and thirteen new interdisciplinary courses involving such topics as "The Use and Abuse of Science and Technology."[91]

Within the distribution requirement structure the changes were so varied that Ladd found it difficult to summarize them. He noted that Wesleyan had eliminated all requirements and left it up to the student to design his own general education program. He also noted that "several cases where the distribution requirements previously had to be met from lists of prescribed courses in the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities, it was (now) generally proposed that any course in those areas be permitted to satisfy the requirement, and...advanced courses in a field would be permitted to serve the purpose."[92] Ladd reports that he senses in the studies of the eleven institutions a possible loss of confidence in general education. He states that the reports "indicated considerable lack of confidence that the general education programs were very well related to the needs and backgrounds of many contemporary students, and they generally proposed arrangements that would give the student more opportunity to seek out courses that would more newly meet his perceived requirements."[93]

In their survey of 26 institutions, including three that were reviewed by Ladd (Brown, Stanford, and Columbia), Levine and Weingart are prepared to conclude that general education has failed. They argue that with "an increasing technological need for greater specialization, general education is increasingly important to provide a basis for common humanity among people," but they found that "no program examined, with the possible exception of St. John's, succeeded in providing this type of general education."[94] They expressed lack of sympathy with the general distribution approach, because they found the bridges that presumably were to be built between the divisions of knowledge were not being constructed.

> There are few general educationists left. Scholarship forces scholars so far apart that they can no longer understand each other. These people are clearly unable to help their students perceive the breadth of their endeavors. Until this situation is reversed through changes in graduate education and reward systems, general education will remain as it is. Colleges can begin to approach this problem by use of incentives in general education efforts. Encouraging departments to move together instead of further apart is imperative. Universities have reached the point where professors in the same department do not have to associate with one another, as noted by the proliferation of journals of different topics in the same field.[95]

They examined the core courses, or as they characterize them "the common, broad, interdisciplinary survey required of all students" at Columbia, Eckerd, Reed and Santa Cruz (Stevenson and Cowell Colleges). Their observation was that the team-taught lecture generally suffered from a lack of cohesion, and that the larger the group of participating faculty, the greater the difficulty in integrating the lectures. They found that Justin Morrill College abandoned a common lecture in its "Inquiry and Expression Program," a team-taught program, after one year.

At least in the colleges they reviewed, they found that student reaction to the distribution type of program was in the main one of indifference. "Few students at any school felt that the distribution forced them to take courses they ordinarily would not have taken."[96] Among the distribution requirements in the 26 colleges studied, they found that the requirements in foreign languages had undergone the least change.

Among different approaches to general education, Levine and Weingart found the freshman seminar to be "the most popular, fastest-growing structure in freshman education." And they also found that faculty and student opinion of the freshman seminars was generally positive.[97] Nevertheless, four significant problems were mentioned in all or most of the programs: "The courses above the freshman level; the instructor is not conducting the seminar but only a lecture course; the courses lack content; and freshmen are often too shy to participate fully." They also found the persistent problem of "the faculty's lack of interest, specially in rigidly departmentalized colleges and graduate-oriented universities."[98]

Among the special general education programs reviewed by Levine and Weingart were the Yale Directed Studies, the Berkeley Experimental College Program, and St. John's Four-Year Program. The common element of these programs was that they were intended for a self-selected group of students working through a core format which absorbed all or part of the participant's time. They found the Yale program "unashamedly elitist" one that aimed to accept only those students who have shown the highest academic promise. Slightly less than 20 percent of the freshman class, approximately 220 students, apply each year, and between 70 and 95 are admitted. Students with College Board scores below 750 are rarely accepted. The courses in the program are specifically designed for the program and are open only to the Directed Studies students. In a critique of the courses, Yale found that the students in their work receive greater faculty attention, a sense of community results from the structure, and the survey courses are viewed as being better than those in the regular curriculum. Yet, the weakness mentioned was the lack of an integrated approach.

The Experimental College Program at Berkeley began in September 1965 and after the end of academic year 1969 was discontinued. For each of the two cycles of the program, applications were received from 325 of the 4800 entering freshmen, and 150 students were randomly selected. Students were required to take one course per semester outside of the program, with two-thirds to three-quarters of the academic load taken within the Experimental College. The curriculum was divided into four periods: Greece, Seventeenth Century England, The American Constitutional Founding and The Contemporary Scene. Theme oriented, the program explored such ideas as freedom and authority, individual and society, war and peace, conscious and the law, acceptance and rebellion. The program included lectures, seminars, and conferences. Attrition in the program seemed to be fairly high; about 40 percent of the students left the program, but some observed that this was the same as the percentage of students in the regular program who left the University. Those who completed the program expressed some difficulty in making the transition from the College to the upper division of the University.[99]

Although the Berkeley Experiment died after a few short years, it may be experiencing a reincarnation of sorts in Strawberry Creek College. Charles Muscatine, with colleagues Sellers, Scott and Hubert and Stuart Dreyfus have inaugurated a two-year program, the New Collegiate Seminar Program, as Strawberry Creek College, named for a stream that makes its way through the Berkeley campus. As Fred Hechinger reports the development, "Unobtrusively housed in a primitive, two-story wooden barracks of World War II vintage, the program is billed as an attempt to 'open a new path to undergraduates aiming for high-quality liberal education with a contemporary flavor.'"[100] Initially, 72 freshmen and sophomores are participating in six seminars averaging 12 students each as the basic activity. The seminars continue for one or more quarters and are led by a full professor who is assisted by a graduate student from a different field "in order to stress the relevance of more than one discipline to the particular topic."[101] The results of each seminar are to be presented for review by all members of the college. Students also enroll in some courses in regular departments. Throughout the two years of the program students and teachers are to evaluate each other.

In reviewing the St. John's program, one of the longer-lived reforms in general education, Levine and Weingart found that the College is maintaining its basic structure of seminars and tutorials and wholly prescribed curriculum. Preceptorials were added in 1962 and provide a nine-week period in which juniors and seniors, with a tutor, can study one book or theme at a time and in depth. The weekly lecture also continues as a part of the original program. The program has been in operation since 1937.[102]

Ann Heiss makes the general observation that "an impressive number of institutions have recently reorganized or are currently reorganizing their undergraduate curriculum. In most cases the change deals specifically with the general education program /and/...generally, the reorganization was preceeded by an intensive institutional self-study."[103] Among the profiles presented, in addition to the colleges noted in the previous two studies, there are references to the University of Michigan; the University of California at Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, Davis and Riverside; Shimer College, a college which in 1974 was fighting for its life; Ottawa College; Vassar; the University of Hawaii; Whittier; Hobart and William Smith Colleges; Saint Olaf College; Goshen College and Beloit College, both which have been mentioned as "transformed" colleges; Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts in Chickasha, the program of which by 1974 had already reverted to a more traditional structure; Manhattanville; Hiram College; Barat College.

It is difficult to generalize from these profiles, because the range of activities included under "changes in general education" varies so much. For example, the reference to changes in general education at the University of Michigan is to the Residential College, "in which diverse offerings replace the liberal arts core of the traditional curriculum and students share responsibility for the character and quality of their academic program." The Michigan program includes "seminars, independent study on individual projects, work-study integrated with course work in the student's major, and a 'furlough semester' during which a student may work on anything he chooses."[104] And at Santa Barbara, the profile refers to the creation of the new unit, the College of Creative Studies, which involves a total curriculum structure, not simply that which might be referred to as "general education." On the other hand, at Berkeley, the change in general education refers to the modification of the art survey courses which have been reorganized into small units taught by senior professors. Perhaps the new development is that senior professors are willing to take the teaching assignments.

The revisions at Vassar involve providing three approaches to a baccalaureate: an independent study program, a concentration in a discipline, and a multidisciplinary concentration. The specific changes in general education relate primarily to the second approach, the concentration in a discipline, the more traditional collegiate degree program, where several variations are possible in the general requirements. Whittier has gone to a contract basis for all of its courses, but the changes in general education appear to be limited to the first year of exploratory course work. Beloit has introduced a Great Books course that focuses on great issues and ideas of man, and at the upper division the College has provided a seminar on "Contemporary Issues." Hobart and Smith Colleges combine several introductory courses, one or two bi-disciplinary courses, and a freshman tutorial. Manhattanville dropped distribution requirements and has moved to a student-designed program of study. Hiram College in 1969 introduced an interdisciplinary studies program, combined with a ten-day Freshman Institute prior to the opening of the school year. Barat's efforts are in freshman studies program, although it is also developing a senior-year integrative sequence.

What is one to infer from these reports? Perhaps general education is not quite as moribund as Levine and Weingart suggest, but if there is any perceptible trend it seems to be one of moving away from prescribed courses to general distribution requirements and from distribution requirements to individually designed or contracted sequences. While there continue to be developed new integrated and new freshman and lower division sequences, the prevailing mood seems to be that of allowing the student "to do his own thing" and to build his own program--albeit with some guidance within broad areas resembling distribution requirements.

The total programs earlier developed by the University of Chicago and recommended for Harvard and Columbia seem to be less the norm and more the exception. The University of Chicago, providing one of the most extensive efforts at developing a total sequence in general education (four years including the equivalent of the last two years of high school and the first two years of college), continued for approximately a quarter of a century but underwent reorganization in 1957-58 when the major system and a regular four-year baccalaureate program was introduced. While maintaining a "lower college" consisting of two years of more or less required common-core subjects, the university went on to develop an "upper" college that included one year specialization in any one of the four divisions and a year of electives. The first two years of the old college were dropped. The program underwent further revision in the mid-1960s and while many of the earlier interdisciplinary courses remained, presently the structure at Chicago has become more of a restricted distribution sequence. The program recommended by the Harvard Committee was never fully introduced, and by the mid-1960s an introduction of an optional feature left very little of the recommendations of the Harvard Committee intact.

What is the status of general education in the mid-1970s? The Chronicle of Higher Education in November, 1973 carried the headline "Student Demands for 'Practical' Education Are Forcing Major Changes in Curricula."[105] The report called attention to the apparently growing preference of students for "practical education that can be put to use immediately" and the demand for "short career-occupational education, a credential, and a job." Not only is student demand causing institutions, according to the report, to offer more career oriented courses, but it is encouraging the development of various types of less than baccalaureate sequences. Students may return later for the A.B., but "a growing number are not inclined to complete four years of traditional college." And the force of such a development is to downgrade interest in general-education type courses or sequences." The report detailed the growth of new specialties and new sequences.

A subsequent article in the Chronicle pointed up the impact of the "new practicality" on the humanities, a basic element of any general education sequence.[106] According to the reporter, students are "reportedly abandoning theoretical, abstract, and purely academic fields for those that relate directly to jobs." Enrollments are down in English and History and the foreign languages. Some faculties are turning to "applied humanities," to the application of the skills of people in the humanities to interdisciplinary problems wherein the humanist teams up with faculty in the more applied fields to deal with immediate issues from a humanistic viewpoint. Whether the combinations will gain support among the general run of academicians remains to be seen.

But the signs are far from being clear. While the evidence seems to be mounting that student orientation to the practical and the applied are forcing a retreat from some of the more traditional modes of general education, Malcolm Scully finds in some places a resurgence of interest in those same modes. Among the examples he uses is Stanford University, where:

> a number of students have become frustrated by the lack of requirements and long for the discipline of the program of general education. The university has reinstated an elective program called 'structured liberal education.'[107]

And he goes on to quote Charles Frankel of Columbia University, Robert Nisbet of the University of Arizona and others to document the proposition that there is emerging a conservative academic counter-revolution.

Nathan Glaser refers to the "crisis of general education."[108] He sees the crisis in relation to one broad area of study, the social sciences, and the difficulty of incorporating the social sciences into general education. The problem Glaser poses is not related to student disinterest but to the disinclination (or inability) of certain disciplines to address themselves to the traditional concerns of general education. Over the years, even in the survey or interdisciplinary approach to general education the social sciences have found the greatest difficulty in accommodating to the general education emphasis on general understanding and cultural heritage.

An evaluation of student reactions to the Integrated Liberal Studies program of the College of Letters and Science of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, suggests that reasons students give for dropping out of this two-year sequence of prescribed courses reflects much of the same mood described in two of the Chronicle articles above.[109] Samuel Kellams found a significant decrease in the persistence rate in the program which was established in 1948. During the first 15 years of its existence, an average of 55 percent of the freshmen enrolling in Integrated Liberal Studies completed four semesters of the program, while in 1967 only about 20 percent continued through the four semesters.[110] In questioning those who dropped, he found that 53 percent complained about "intensity of focus," some 35 percent found the courses not appealing to their interests, 23 percent found the course material (content and teaching) unexciting. Others called into question the lack of flexibility, the lack of contact with other students in the university. (Since students could give more than one reason, the percentages add to more than 100).

In his review of general education, Stanley Ikenberry finds the broader movements in higher education in general having a decided impact on the form and future of general education, "In very large part, the difficulties of general education have come from its sometimes valiant attempts to swim upstream against the major currents of society and against the dominant forces in American colleges and universities."[111] The expansion in enrollments, the move to "universal" postsecondary education. the diversity among students, the growth of professionalism and specialization, and the diversity in views about the functions of higher education, these and other developments work against the traditional conceptions of general education. And if general education is to survive, says Ikenberry, there must be a complete reformulation that "must recognize the substantial changes that have taken place in American higher education during recent decades." He calls for a sweeping reexamination of the assumptions on which general education programs have been built.

As James G. Rice of Stephens College (Missouri) observes the great variety of activities currently labeled "general education," he asks "Is general education going in all directions at once?"[112] Indeed, with so much variation in application, one may well ask whether the term is useful any longer. Rice argues that in spite of the apparent chaos there is some rhyme and meaning to it all. The many experiments in general education can be grouped under five broad categories--mixing real-life experiences with academic and campus experiences; developing interdisciplinary and problem-centered courses and programs; providing "primary experience"; emphasizing independent work; and providing ways for expanding and heightening the student's awareness of other persons, of the world and himself. The common theme in most of these approaches, says Rice, is that they "relate themselves to personality-based learning theory and...they are searches for a pedagogy consonant with it."[113] He goes on to argue that general education is very much alive and that:

> the common core of undergraduate experience which we call general education is now on many campuses being sought not in a common content, subject matter, body of knowledge, but in common experiences, common problems, common exposures to reality and the larger society.[114]

To his own earlier stated question, "General Education: Has Its Time Come Again?", Rice answers with a strong affirmative.

Other Developments

We have examined in greater length the developments in general education, because concern for general education seemed to dominate so much of the thinking during the 1940s and through much of the 1950s. While there were certainly other aspects of the curriculum that were under study and that were changed during that period, how to develop more effective general programs was a recurring theme--and it seems to remain, in various forms, as a concern in the 1970s. But we now turn to some of the other developments. While we cannot deal with them in the same depth as we have attempted to treat general education, and while we shall not attempt to provide an exhaustive listing, we shall give attention to some of the more frequently noted developments.

Concentration or Majors.--Along with the examination of general education or the common aspects of curriculum, there has been a continuing concern about the nature and extent of the specialized area, the concentration or major. While Lowell was out of sympathy with the free elective system fostered by his predecessor, Charles W. Eliot, he did not during his own administration attempt to go back to a wholly prescribed curriculum. As we have already noted, he announced that Harvard was combining the general education and concentrated studies in a fairly well defined undergraduate sequence. At the same time David Starr Jordon in California was encouraging the development of the major-minor system at Stanford. During the 20th century most undergraduate colleges have adopted a combination of breadth and depth, variations on the general education and major or concentration system.

In their review of developments between 1955 and 1967 in the random sample of 322 institutions, Paul Dressel and Frances DeLisle found that the way in which undergraduate colleges organized the "depth experience" varied considerably. Approximately 85 percent of the institutions reviewed called for some type of concentration for "pursuing a discipline or program of special interest to insure understanding in depth in at least one area of man's knowledge."[115] The most frequent pattern was that of the departmental major. Approximately one-fourth of the institutions in the sample specified a departmental major without any reference to a minor or secondary emphasis, and over half indicated the departmental major with a minor or secondary emphasis. Barely over two percent specified an inter-departmental, divisional, area or theme type of concentration. Between 1957 and 1967 the emphasis upon the departmental major without minor or secondary emphasis increased from 18.9 percent of the institutions to 24.8 of the institutions. The specification of a departmental major with a minor or secondary emphasis decreased during this period of time from 62.4 percent of the institutions to 56.2 percent. During the same period of time the number of institutions indicating no specific requirements for a major or concentration increased from 15.5 percent to 16.8 percent.[116]

Within the arts and humanities the number of credit hours specified for the major or concentration increased slightly. Both in 1957 and 1967 the modal requirement was 24 to 32 credits or eight courses, but 45.3 percent of the institutions specified that type of concentration in 1957 and only 39.1 percent specified it in 1967. Moreover, in 1957 nearly two-thirds of the institutions required 24 to 32 credits, or less, while in 1967 only 53.7 percent specified 24 to 32 hours or less. That means that a higher proportion were specifying more than 24 to 32 credits in 1967 than was the case in 1957.

In the natural sciences there was a similar change, but perhaps not as striking. The sciences in both periods specified more hours for a major or concentration than was the case for the arts. In both periods the modal pattern was 24 to 32 credits; in 1957 some 38.5 percent of the institutions made this specification, but by 1967 the percentage had decreased to 33.9 percent. Likewise, in 1957 just over one-half of the institutions specified between 24 and 32 credits, or less, for a major in the sciences; in 1967 this proportion had gone down to 46.9 percent. In other words, more than half of the institutions required more than 24 to 32 credits for a major in the sciences in 1967. Dressel and DeLisle note that "though prevailing practices can be identified, the course and credit requirements for a major concentration vary widely and are difficult to interpret or compare because of different concepts of what constitutes a major." And thus while the broad outlines can be drawn, it is difficult to generalize beyond what we have noted above.

In the 26 institutions examined by Levine and Weingart, it was found that the emphasis continues to be upon the departmental majors or concentrations. They noted, however, that departments in the social sciences, humanities, and arts have lessened the requirements somewhat, "so that only one-fourth to one-third of a student's courses must be in his major, and have reduced the number of specific requirements to as few as one or two common courses."[117] They found that the departments in the natural sciences have maintained a large number of required courses in the major sequence. It is somewhat difficult to interpret the findings of Levine and Weingart, since in the review by Dressel and DeLisle, it appears that the humanities and arts had actually increased their requirements for a major during 1957-1967, while Levine and Weingart suggest a decrease in the requirements. The samples of institutions differ in the two studies.

Levine and Weingart make note of several variations of the departmental major. At Bard College freshmen may select a "trial major" to provide some degree of concentration early in the student's career. The "success" of the program seems, however, to be questionable. The writers also found a few schools that have provided double or joint majors; Santa Cruz and Haverford are singled out, but in both institutions considerably less than 10 percent of the students undertake joint or double majors. Another variation was the interdepartmental major, but the writers found this option employed in a limited number of cases. In nine of the 26 institutions there were "student-created" majors in which students were allowed to write a proposal for a concentration, describing the courses and independent study combinations planned. Approval of the major "usually involves consultation with a number of people--advisers, department chairman, and prospective teachers" and in spite of the fact that most of the plans submitted by the students were accepted, relatively few students made use of the option. Three of the 26 schools--St. John's, Sarah Lawrence and New College--did not specify a concentration or major.

Among the institutions Ladd studied, he found that all of the institutions required a major or concentration, and relatively little had been done in the way of reviewing this area of the curriculum in the self-studies undertaken by the colleges. Ladd suggests that "this appears to be forbidden territory for college or university committees, and vigilantly guarded turf of the departments."[118] He suggests that students and faculties generally were able to influence very little the content of the typical departmental major. Only Michigan State University and Brown examined in their self-studies the content and scope of majors. The Michigan State study suggested a reduction in the total number of majors and Brown proposed more opportunity for student-designed majors. Ladd's generalization is: "In sum, then, the major or concentration remains a focal point in undergraduate education. Since few of these reports really discuss the matter, there was apparently never any question but that it should so remain. A few reports did delve into the basic nature of the major, but none included any serious analysis of what an undergraduate program might be without a major."[119]

The review by Ann Heiss does not attempt to summarize the current status of departmental majors or concentration but rather points up those cases in which some variations have been introduced. She notes:

> Within the past several years many colleges and universities have introduced structural changes to try to make academic institutions more functional and relevant to the social context in which they operate. These changes include the formulation of interdisciplinary centers, intradepartmental units, planning or coordinating committees or commissions, and information and referral offices that make the resources of the institution available to industry and government service agencies, or act as ombudsman for the campus community.[120]

Reference is made to the introduction of human resources, community service and public affairs type of curricula. Among the institutions noted are: The College of Human Resources and Education at the University of West Virginia; The Wallace School of Community Service and Public Affairs at the University of Oregon; The College of Environmental Design at the University of California at Berkeley; The College of Human Development at the Pennsylvania State University; The College of Human Ecology at Cornell University; The Institute for Human Services at Boston College; The Division of General and Interdisciplinary Studies at the University of Washington; The division for Experimental and Multidisciplinary Programs at the University of Hawaii. Reference is also made to the Collegiate System at the State University of New York at Buffalo, which is a series of small living-learning units and special workshops designed to undertake programs that single departments had not been able to sustain.

In their discussion of "Alternative to Departments," Levine and Weingart found a number of examples of what they called "extradepartmental programs and broader faculty organization." Bard has used divisions as the major structural units. Eckerd and New College also started with an emphasis on divisions, and Reed uses divisions for administering course offerings. In addition, the University of California at Santa Cruz, the University of Wisconsin at Green Bay and Prescott College had developed interdisciplinary structures "to avoid departmental domination." In Bard, Eckerd, New College and Reed the divisions, however, apparently had little impact upon the development of interdepartmental concentrations. Santa Cruz was satisfied with the divisional arrangement, although it found the interdisciplinary structure something of a barrier in seeking new faculty. The Prescott structure seemed to remain viable, although some students complained that programs and offerings were "either too diverse or too broad." Green Bay appears to have been successful in maintaining its structure, although Levine and Weingart suggest that even Prescott, Santa Cruz and Green Bay have not been "completely successful in establishing an interdisciplinary structure."[121]

While there have been shifts in credit hour requirements for majors--mostly minor in character--and while there have been some attempts to develop alternatives to the departmental structure--still on a limited scale in comparison to the prevailing structure --the mid-1970s have been characterized in perhaps greater measure with shifts in enrollments and emphases among academic departments. Issues of the Chronicle of Higher Education for the last few years provide partial documentation for these shifts. Undergraduate enrollments in history courses have dropped by 12.6 percent between 1970-71 and 1973-74. Faint comfort was derived by some observers in that decreases in New England and the South were of a smaller order than elsewhere.[122] Yet while enrollments in history generally were declining, medieval studies were experiencing a boom of sorts. In 1960 there were two centers of medieval studies at universities in North America, but by early 1974 there were more than 40, and many colleges--from Yale to Swarthmore to Central Missouri State--were reporting steady increases in both graduate and undergraduate enrollments.[123]

Foreign language departments have experienced even more rapid declines. One recent survey reported a 10 percent decline between 1970 and 1972.[124] The basic reason for the decline appears to be the move on the part of many institutions to drop foreign languages as a graduation requirement--down from 92 percent of the institutions in 1966 to 77 percent in 1970, and continuing to decline somewhat. On the other hand, "exotic" languages such as Chinese, Hebrew, Japanese and Swahili have had increased enrollments. Language departments are in some institutions seeking to recover enrollments by developing courses that emphasize the uses of foreign language in employment and travel.[125]

Psychology faces the opposite situation. Enrollments have been increasing dramatically, and it is estimated that from 5 to 10 percent of college students in the United States are majoring in psychology.[126] Within the fields of psychology, students apparently favor clinical over experimental concentrations. With the high enrollments in the field, some observers are questioning whether this is all to the good. It is noted that all too many persons with an undergraduate degree in psychology "wind up taking jobs that have nothing whatever to do with the subject."[127] Sociology departments, also experiencing increased enrollments, are reexamining the functions of their degree programs, particularly at the graduate level. One sociologist, Paul Lazarsfeld, advocates more programs in applied sociology, because sociologists have had trouble in bridging the gap between finding data and knowing what to do about them.[128] Some political scientists have also been calling for more "relevance" in their course work:

> Peace studies have proliferated. The study of political establishments is now balanced by courses on less traditional topics. Students no longer learn all their political science in classrooms, but often earn credit by working in government offices.[129]

The social sciences generally seem to be experiencing growths in enrollments and are at the same time reassessing programs and sequences.

Enrollments in physics are reported to be declining. Chemistry faces both boom and shortages. Enrollment has been growing at the undergraduate level--probably aided by the dramatic increases in pre-medicine and other health-science programs--while enrollments in graduate programs have declined sharply.[130] For the natural sciences generally, some observers forsee new programs and increased enrollments as the impact of the energy crisis is felt; "energy studies" will become one of the new glamour fields.[131]

The last few paragraphs have touched only lightly and nonselectively on shifts in enrollments and emphases among academic departments. The resulting picture is far from clear if one seeks some firm basis for projecting developments in the next five to ten years, but what does emerge is an apparent responsiveness by most departments to new developments in the academic market. Perhaps it is in the adjustments (or lack of adjustment) among academic departments that some of the most significant curricular changes will take place in the next decade.

New Fields for Concentration.--In addition to various interdepartmental and interdisciplinary concentrations, a number of new types of studies have emerged. Heiss notes the following: ethnic studies, black studies, environmental studies, nonWestern studies, women's studies, futuristics computer science, policy science, arms control and foreign policy, peace studies, the management of change, forensic science, drug and alcohol addiction, ethics in medicine. She notes that approximately two-thirds of the colleges and universities in the country have introduced programs in ethnic studies. Black studies are found in over 400 institutions. Urban and environmental studies are apparently growing rapidly. More than 100 colleges and universities offer courses in the field of futuristics, courses concerned with planning and forecasting.

John Creager, in a study undertaken by the American Council on Education and based on responses from 669 institutions in the spring of 1973, found 57.1 percent of the institutions reporting interdepartment or interdisciplinary courses with 94 percent of the private universities reporting this type of program. He also found that 44.7 percent reported ethnic studies, 14.6 percent reported women's studies, 18.4 percent reported off-campus studies in special American sub-cultures.[132]

The literature on ethnic studies has become voluminous, and we have no intention of attempting to assess the impact of such studies on the American college campus. We simply note in passing some comments that have appeared in recent publications. The Chronicle of Higher Education devoted an issue in May, 1972 to "Higher Education and the Black American." John Crowl's article in that issue summarized developments to that date. Ann Heiss' Inventory noted that some 400 institutions included black studies in the curriculum. Crowl reports that 200 institutions had some sort of black studies program and another 400 offered courses in black history or culture.[133] He listed among the difficulties encountered by the programs: many of the more politically oriented black students criticize the programs for being too academic; some black educators consider the programs poorly conceived and planned; many programs have received only grudging acceptance in white academic circles; some administrators say there is a lack of qualified faculty members; the programs may constitute the only black presence on white campuses; some programs, especially those established with outside funds, face cutbacks in funds.

Yet, with all of the problems, black studies programs seem to have gained enough acceptance to be able to anticipate continuance at most major institutions. Indeed, a new sub-field called "black politics" appears to be developing within political science.[134] A study conducted in 1972 and involving interviews with 209 sociologists from a representative group of 70 colleges and universities in the United States explored patterns of response to the black studies movement.[135] Four basic patterns are described--embracement, antagonism, accommodation, and withdrawal or dropout. Among the 209, some 28 percent were characterized as embracers, 22 percent as antagonists, 30 percent as accommodators, and 20 percent as dropouts. As the author notes, "The finding that young sociologists, blacks, and perhaps women were more favorably disposed toward black studies might have been expected."[136]

The emergence of white ethnic studies has been observed as the latest addition to the list of special-interest group studies that began with black studies in the late 1960s.[137] The new programs are variously labeled "Euro-American," "immigrant," or "white ethnic" studies, and they deal with the experiences in America of European immigrants. In New York several Italian-American projects are in evidence. The University of Minnesota has established an Immigration Studies Collection. Sonoma State College in California has courses in Euro-American studies. There is a growing number of courses under the title of "Jewish Studies." Not all observers are predicting significant growth in these areas. Norman Lederer, director of the University of Wisconsin system's Ethnic and Minority Studies Center sees a "relatively drab" future for white ethnic studies.

Women's studies seem to be growing in number and variety. One reporter notes a growth from a "handful" of courses in the late 1960s to an estimated 2,000 such courses offered in 1973-74, studies that examine the "roles, contributions, and treatment of women."[138] Courses range from those based in a single discipline, such as the history or psychology of women, to broad, interdisciplinary courses examining women's status. Some 75 programs, as distinct from the offering of one or more discrete courses, have been established in the last three years, and four universities were reported during 1973-74 to be offering master's degrees in women's studies.

Calendar Variations.--While over the years there had been some shifting between the quarter and semester calendars, the semester structure (two semesters of fifteen to seventeen weeks per academic year) provided the typical college calendar during the first half of the 20th century. Then, in the early 1960s, with the introduction, or perhaps it was reintroduction, of the intersession, a variety of new types of college calendars emerged. In her review of the current status, Ann Heiss gives examples of the intersession with the four-one-four format (two terms of semester-length, during which students enroll in four courses, and an intersession of approximately one month with enrollment in one course), the three-three structure (students enroll in three courses during each of three quarter-length terms of ten to twelve weeks), the modular course plan (students enroll in one course in three to four week blocks of time), the varied semester-length calendar, movable calendars (students may begin at almost any time during the year), presessions and postsessions.[139] While the semester plan apparently continues to predominate, it is by far less of a margin than was the case before the new plans were adopted.

Among the newer calendars, one of the more popular is the four-one-four with the intersession. Over 500 colleges and universities have introduced some kind of January intersession, although not all of the colleges have adopted the four-course pattern for each of the longer sessions. The University of Denver, for example, is maintaining a quarter calendar but has introduced a three-week period in December as an intersession. Other institutions have maintained the semester structure with courses of varying credit-hour designations, while still employing the intersession. While Bennington and Sarah Lawrence Colleges had incorporated an interim and off-campus unit in their calendars in the 1920s, the great interest in the four-one-four developed in the early 1960s with the efforts of Florida Presbyterian College, now Eckerd College. Indeed, the program is popular enough to have generated a professional association known as the Four-One-Four Conference and which publishes an Interim Digest and an annual catalog listing the interim courses of member institutions. Florida Presbyterian College has reported from its studies that the interim encourages a more relaxed approach to learning, that students apparently perform better--at least they earn higher grades and fewer of them fail courses. Jack Rossmann of Macalester College reports on some of the research undertaken at that institution.[140] At Macalester the grading is on a satisfactory-unsatisfactory basis only, and courses offered during the interim are different from those offered during the regular term, and students may undertake independent and off-campus study projects. Over the years, Macalester has noticed a significant decrease in the percentage of students enrolling in on-campus, faculty-directed group courses, an increase in the off-campus independent study and off-campus, faculty-directed group courses. On-campus independent study has remained fairly stable. Approximately 40 percent of the students took courses outside of their major area, although students majoring in the fine arts enrolled predominately in fine arts courses during the interim. Over the years approximately three-quarters of the students have rated the interim term as "extremely rewarding" or "more than usually rewarding." Rossmann finds that the interim course has also influenced some of the general university policies, including the expansion of the satisfactory-unsatisfactory grading system, the reduction of general institutional requirements, and the introduction of new procedures in regular term courses.

James Davis reviews some of the reasons for calendar changes.[141] He suggests that the major focus of the four-one-four calendar is upon the single term and it is probably the interim that accounts for its popularity; the one month period and one course unit provide opportunities for experimentation not found in the regular term. The trimester, three semester-length terms, has been identified with the University of Pittsburgh, the University of Michigan and Harper College, although a number of other institutions have adopted this variation. In many of the institutions the summer trimester becomes in effect two or three shorter term units. Colorado College has been identified with the modular course plan, although its program is a variation of the calendar of Hiram and Ureka Colleges, and of which some variations have taken place over the years. Colorado College uses the basic unit of three-and-a-half weeks of study followed by a four-and-a-half day break.

Another way of looking at the college academic calendar is to place it within the broader context of the organization of instruction. Kuhns and Martorana refer to four organizational modes: (1) concurrent courses, (2) time modules, (3) academic modules, and (4) competency.[142] The advantage of employing their perspective is that it enables one to examine calendar variations in terms of the broader and more fundamental issues residing in the instructional process, and as the writers suggest, such an analysis "may offer the possibility of an educational systhesis which is more holistic for the individual student than the current discipline-based organization of knowledge."[143]

Procedural Changes.--One may include in this category a wide variety of programming elements including new grading systems, variations on advising, development of contract and performance-based courses, various types of off-campus programs, honors programs, and the like.

In their review of 26 colleges, Levine and Weingart found that one of the major problems in any variation in grading systems was the reaction of graduate schools. Non-traditional grading patterns generally met with problems, traditional grades were readily accepted by the graduate schools.

> At the twenty sample schools, with four explainable exceptions, a clear pattern was observed: traditional grades accompanied by no graduate school difficulties, or non-traditional grades accompanied by graduate school difficulties....The problems created by graduate schools offer little promise of prompt resolution. Even at those universities with non-traditional grading systems at the undergraduate level, many administrators and faculty refuse to change admissions policies at their own graduate and professional schools. The University of Michigan

> Medical School, for example, will not accept written evaluations from the Residential College; the Law School, in contrast, will accept the evaluations but will not promise to read them. Similarly, many graduate departments at Brown will not consider pass/fail-graded Brown students.[144]

The writers contended that letter and numerical grades, presumably more objective, were not so, commenting that "our study does not substantiate the objectivity usually attributed to letter and numerical grades." Ten of the 26 schools in their review used written evaluations, but problems involved in these included length of time required for writing "good" evaluations, poorly designed evaluation forms, lack of commitment on the part of the faculty to produce adequate descriptions. Oral examinations were used in a limited number of cases. Some colleges used covert grading, letter-graded systems employed only for external use and variations of the pass/fail and credit/no credit systems. No one of the systems was without difficulty, although the writers leaned toward some type of written evaluation.

In the review undertaken by Ladd, all of the colleges and universities employed a more or less standard letter grade system. While there was agreement that grading creates fears and anxiety and that any system appeared to be "deceptively refined" and "inadequate in the dimensions of work that it measures and the amount of information about progress that it provides," all of the studies he reviewed accepted the necessity for some kind of evaluation and with few exceptions retained the traditional system. Swarthmore and Brown proposed written comments, and Brown and Stanford introduced a total "pass-erase system."[145]

Heiss found that approximately two-thirds of the nation's colleges and universities had introduced some variation of a pass-fail system. Some eight percent of the colleges were reported as not recording failing grades, and approximately 70 percent of the institutions restricted the number of pass-fail courses open to a student to one-fifth of the program or to one course per term.

Others limited the option to courses outside of the student's major. Other variations in grading included the "cumulative portfolio" in which written comments by instructors, statements by students and samples of work were combined in a comprehensive review of student progress. A number of colleges had also introduced outside examiners, particularly in situations involving off-campus and external-degree programs.

A survey of the acceptance of grades at 350 undergraduate institutions, 200 graduate schools, 50 law schools and 50 medical schools revealed that the traditional A-to-F grading system is favored by most undergraduate institutions as well as by graduate and professional schools.[146] It appears that the more nontraditional grades that a student has on his record, the more problems he faces in transferring to other colleges or gaining admission to professional study. Undergraduate institutions are more open to nontraditional grading systems than are graduate and professional schools. Yet, as Harold Hodgkinson has observed, the pass-fail option seems to be on the increase.[147]

Barbara von Wittich gathered data on 1,331 Iowa State University students enrolled in elementary foreign-language courses during the spring quarter, 1970, in order to determine if there were any differences in performance between students enrolled under a pass-fail system and those enrolled for conventional grades. Since instructors were not aware which students were enrolled under pass-fail, they provided letter grades for all students, and it was possible, using the letter grade as the criterion, to compare performance of the two groups. Just over one-third of the students enrolled under pass-fail. When compared with other students in the language classes, when compared with their performance in other subjects taken under the letter-grade system, and when compared in other pass-fail vs. letter-grade course enrollments, students enrolled for pass-fail generally performed at lower levels in those pass-fail courses. The writer concluded that any subjects involving cumulative learning should not be offered under pass-fail "if good results and adequate progress are expected."[148]

Another area in which considerable attention is being focused is that of advising. Here too the wholly adequate system is yet to be found. Levine and Weingart found in their sample of institutions that there continues to be a fairly clear division between "the affective and cognitive components of learning" and most university counseling programs separate the academic and personal advising. Yet, most faculty, students and administrators interviewed by the two writers judged the advising to be poor. Indeed, they judged that as many as three-fifths of the students in the schools "chose not to see their adviser, and a significant number of students indicated instead a preference for obtaining advice from administrators, faculty, and student friends."[149] Generally little incentive was offered to faculty members for advising; the role of the adviser was ill-defined. They concluded that with the exception of one institution, the advising systems were "grossly inadequate." Perhaps the key to the inadequate advising, according to Levine and Weingart, is that "faculty are rewarded largely for research and teaching in their specialty, so that their interests necessarily exclude advising."[150]

Variations in advising noted by Levine and Weingart were the use of student advisers at Brown and Justin Morrill Colleges. At three institutions the freshman-seminar instructors served as freshman advisers. One college had introduced a group advising session called "Freshman Inquiry." The session took place toward the end of the freshman year and the freshmen were required to prepare a fifteen hundred-word essay for the Inquiry regarding their current intellectual position and their plan for a future course of study. Most of the faculty and students involved in the program found it helpful.

In his review, Ladd contended that the core of the academic advising problem lay in the "large size and the routinization and superficiality of relationships which seem to accompany it" in the typical American university. All of the systems he reviewed had in common the intent "to provide students with information about courses and programs available and requirements to be met." He also found a type of "policing" involved in that the advisers were to make sure that the student completed the kinds of requirements the institution had established. These systems were also to "insure that each student had a faculty member to whom he could go for advice about courses, program selection, or career choices (and at least as students generally see it) to whom he could talk in an informal fashion."[151] All of the institutional studies noted that advising was a major problem and that by-and-large faculty members simply did not accept or like the advising job.

> Few faculty members care to see themselves as a cog in the bureaucratic machinery--as mere initialers of student course schedules and as policemen. Most faculty members also have a real and undoubtedly healthy reluctance toward becoming involved with student's emotional problems....A second problem concerns the amount of time that advising can consume....A further problem has, in a sense, been created by changes recommended in the studies...moves toward greater freedom for students involve a responsibility to ensure that students who wish it have ready access to sound advice....Faculty advisers frequently do not know enough about courses and programs available or about requirements to give students good advice even if they wanted to take the necessary time....Thus the advising system tends to fail both as a channel of information and as a basis for significant contact between students and faculty members.[152]

Ladd was of the opinion that the information functions could probably be better met by more timely, clear and informative descriptions of courses, programs and requirements. He also suggested the need for developing an advising core, but he immediately recognized the difficulty of securing faculty commitment even at this level.

In the material reviewed by Ann Heiss, there appeared to be some move toward making advising "as important for faculty as is the classroom teaching role."[153] Examples singled out were the University of California at Irvine, Ottawa University and Evergreen State College as well as California State University at San Jose. Chatham College in Pittsburgh has developed a broad range advising system in which each student is assigned to an adviser who is to assist in defining goals, selecting the context within which the goals may be realized and to assist in interpreting student's test results to the individual. Advising for freshmen begins a week before classes and at the end of the second semester, one week is designated as advising week. As another variation, a number of institutions have established the office of ombudsman, and "as a disinterested intermediary, the ombudsman can take a student's complaint or concerns to the appropriate office without implicating him."[154] Heiss suggests that the role of the ombudsman can be very important on a campus, especially in the early stages of policy decisions.

Epilogue

As we have already noted, we have not intended that this review will reflect all, or even a majority of the current developments in curriculum among colleges and universities in North America. Rather, we have pointed to those developments which would seem most to relate to undergraduate and particularly the smaller undergraduate colleges. For those who wish to explore some of the developments in greater depths, the references in the Notes should be helpful. In particular we would refer to Ann Heiss' Inventory of Academic Innovation and Patricia Cross' Planning Non-Traditional Programs.[155] The annotated bibliography by William Mahler in the last-named volume is particularly helpful.

We have not referred to Canadian sources, although we surely should have noted developments at York University, opened in 1959 and to the multivolume report on education in Ontario, Ontario's Educative Society.[156] Reginald Edwards refers to the extent to which education in Canada has been, since the establishment of the nation in 1867, a provincial concern and that since 1960 each province "has been forced to make plans for dealing with its one or more universities" and that presently, all provinces except Saskatchewan and Newfoundland have a University Grants Commission or equivalent.[157] But Claude Bissell writes that until the early 1960s the provinces gave little serious attention to education:

> The government in the Maritime Provinces left the development of higher education largely in the hands of sectarian interests. In Quebec, the Roman Catholic church dominated the scene, with the exception of McGill....In Ontario, the University of Toronto enjoyed a somewhat shadowy primacy as a provincial university, and the other institutions relied largely on church and benefactions. In the west, the universities were the closest approximation to the land-grant institutions in the United States.[158]

He goes on to argue that to speak of systems of higher education in Canada is to refer to developments in the last 10 years. Fleming describes the developments in each of the universities in Ontario, and his review lends substance to the view that many of the changes in the university curriculum have been effected since the early 1960s.[159] Many of the changes involve new degree sequences and the expansion of interdisciplinary work. The emphasis of the university, furthermore, remains primarily that of "the preservation, transmission and increase of knowledge."[160] Roles encompassed in the "multiversity" in the United States are reflected in different post-secondary institutions in Canada--teachers colleges, colleges of applied arts and technology, polytechnical institutes, colleges of agricultural technology, schools of nursing and other professional schools.

Other specific variations found in colleges and universities in the United States deserve more attention, were this monograph to be more comprehensive. Cooperative education, hardly new, is apparently experiencing a resurgence of interest. Established in 1906 at the University of Cincinnati, the factor that transformed Antioch College in 1921, cooperative education grew slowly until the mid-1960s. In 1960 there were about 60 institutions with programs, and now there are over 400.[161] Courses by newspaper are in the second year and are available in some 200 dailies and weeklies.[162] External degree programs are growing.[163] The Twenty-Ninth National Conference on Higher Education devoted considerable attention to external degree programs and to learning contracts.[164] Endorsed by the Commission on Non-Traditional Study,[165] the external degree was greeted with some words of caution earlier in a paper by Stephen Bailey.[166] The three-year baccalaureate at first seemed to be gaining a following, but institutions are apparently having second thoughts.[167]

These and numerous other variations are being discussed in the current literature on instructional programs in higher education. One may take the position that little that is radically new has appeared in the last decade, but it is difficult to escape the conclusion that more colleges and universities are engaged in some form of curricular study and/or revision than ever before. By far, most of the attempts fall within Hefferlin's third category, accretion or attrition, and the long-range success of such efforts will probably be directly related to the extent to which consciously or unconsciously those responsible for changes are able to take into account Axelrod's observations regarding the systemic nature of curricular reform. Some institutions find themselves transformed, and new institutions continue to surface--to note Hefferlin's two other categories. The major challenge to new institutions is to maintain the uniqueness that justified their founding--and to survive.

Notes

[1] Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford, "The Curriculum in the Perspective of the Theory of Personality Development," *The American College*, edited by Nevitt Sanford (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1962), pp. 418-419.

[2] Samuel Baskin (ed.), *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965), pp. 318-332.

[3] Council on Higher Education, "Innovative and Non-Traditional Study Programs," (Olympia, Washington: Council on Higher Education, State of Washington, 1972), p. 1.

[4] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Reform on Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), p. 10.

[5] *Ibid*., p. 2.

[6] Ernest L. Boyer, "Breaking the Youth Ghetto," *Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education*, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), pp. 5-6.

[7] Charles E. Silberman, "The Remaking of American Education," *New Teaching, New Learning*, edited by G. Kerry Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1971), p. 229.

[8] Harold Taylor, *Students Without Teachers* (New York: Avon Books, 1969), p. 153.

[9] David H. Bayley, "The Emptiness of Curriculum Reform," *Journal of Higher Education*, XLIII (November, 1972), pp. 591-592.

[10] Ann Heiss, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform* (Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973).

[11] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 48.

[12] Harold L. Hodgkinson, *Institutions in Transition: A Profile of Change in Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971), p. xv.

[13] Cf. Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1968) and David Riesman, *Constraint and Variety in American Education* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, 1956).

[14] "A Report Card on All Those Campus Reforms of the 60s," *U.S. News and World Report*, 76(May 6, 1974), pp. 29-30.

[15] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, *Reform of Undergraduate Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), p. 8.

[16] Joseph Axelrod, "Curricular Change: A Model for Analysis," *The Research Reporter*, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, III(no. 3, 1968), p. 1.

[17] Cf. p. 8.

[18] Ecclesiastes 1:9 (King James version of *Old Testament*).

[19] Ann Heiss, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform*, *op. cit*.

[20] John A. Creager, *Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education*, ACE Research Reports, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1973 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1973).

[21] Harold L. Hodgkinson, *Institutions in Transition*, *op. cit*.

[22] Cf. William A. Mahler, "An Annotated Bibliography with Overviews," *Planning Non-Traditional Programs*, edited by K. Patricia Cross, et al (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974), pp. 175-218.

[23] JB Lon Hefferlin, *The Dynamics of Academic Reform* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1969).

[24] "College Openings and Closings," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, VIII (September 24, 1973), p. 2.

[25] Lewis B. Mayhew, "The New Colleges," *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments*, *op. cit*., pp. 19-20.

[26] "New College Offers to Join University of South Florida," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, VIII (May 20, 1974), p. 5.

[27] David Riesman, Joseph Gusfield and Zelda Gamson, *Academic Values and Mass Education: The Early Years of Oakland and Monteith* (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1971).

[28] *Ibid*., p. 15.

[29] *Ibid*., pp. 16-17.

[30] *Ibid*., pp. 68-69.

[31] *Ibid*., p. 78.

[32] Cf. Ann Heiss, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform*, *op. cit*., pp. 1-17.

[33] Cf. *Bulletin of New College*, 6 (September, 1970).

[34] Cf. *Bulletin of Florida Presbyterian College*, 1971-72.

[35] Council on Higher Education, *Innovative and Non-Traditional Programs*, *op. cit*., pp. 54-57.

[36] Franklin Patterson and Charles R. Longworth, *The Making of a College: Hampshire College Working Paper Number One*. (Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press, 1966).

[37] John Walsh, "Hampshire College: A Quest for Quality, a Balanced Budget," *Science*, 170(November 27, 1970), p. 955.

[38] Randall P. Kunkel, "A Study of the Maintenance and Alteration of Policies and Practices in Selected Innovative Institutions of Higher Education," Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Denver, 1973, pp. 107-108.

[39] Peter Bloch and Nancy Nylen, "Hampshire College: New Intents and Old Realities," *Change*, 6(October, 1974), p. 39.

[40] *Ibid*., p. 41.

[41] *Ibid*., p. 42.

[42] Cf. Diane Ravitch, "The Dreams of Livingston College," *Change*, I(May-June, 1969), pp. 36-39.

[43] American Council on Education, *New Academic Institutions: A Survey* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1972).

[44] *Ibid*., p. 87.

[45] *Ibid*., p. 29.

[46] Cf. Orde Coombs, "The Necessity of Excellence: Nairobi College," *Change* %(April, 1973), pp. 38-44.

[47] *Announcements of Simon's Rock College*, 1973-74, p. 6.

[48] *Ibid*., p. 8.

[49] L. Drewe Keller and Victor P. Meskill, "Empire College--Fad or Innovation?" *Journal of General Education*, XXV(October, 1973), pp. 187-198.

[50] *Ibid*., p. 187.

[51] Larry A. Van Dyne, "Experimental Colleges: Uneasy Freedom, Mind-Bending Strains--and Hope," *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, VI(May 15, 1972), p. 4.

[52] *Ibid*.

[53] *Ibid*.

[54] Randall P. Kunkel, *op. cit*., pp. 198 ff.

[55] *Ibid*., pp. 211-213.

[56] Robert D. Brown, "Evaluation of Experimental Colleges," *Journal of Higher Education*, XLIII(February, 1972), pp. 133-134.

[57] *Ibid*., p. 134.

[58] Cf. Peter Bloch and Nancy Nylen, "Hampshire College: New Intents and Old Realities," op. cit.

[59] Paul L. Dressel (ed.), The New Colleges: Toward An Appraisal (Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1971), preface.

[60] Robert A. Altman, The Upper Division College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970), p. 76.

[61] John Coyne and Tom Hebert, This Way Out: A Guide to Alternatives to Traditional College Education in the United States, Europe and the Third World (New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1972).

[62] Wayne Blaze, et al. Guide to Alternative Colleges and Universities (Boston: Beacon Press, 1974).

[63] Cf. Allan O. Pfnister, "Everyone Overseas! Goshen College Pioneers," International and Educational Cultural Exchange, VIII (Fall, 1972), pp. 1-12. Also, The Humane Studies Program: Perspectives on Meaning and Destiny, A Prospectus on General Education developed by the Goshen Faculty, September, 1973.

[64] George A. Drake, "An Analysis of the Colorado College Plan," Critique: A Quarterly Memorandum of the University of Toledo Center for the Study of Higher Education (March, 1973.) cf. also Jack Magarrell, "One-Course-at-a-Time Plan Is a Success at Colorado College," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (December 17, 1973), p. 3.

[65] For recent reviews of St. John's College, cf. Philip W. Semas, "Keeping Quiet Is Hardest Part of Job for a Tutor at St. John's College," Journal of Higher Education, VI(February 28, 1972), pp. 1, 4; also Gerald Grant and David Riesman, "St. John's and the Great Books," Change, 6(May, 1974), pp. 28-36, 62-63.

Antioch College is discussed in Gerald Grant, "Let a Hundred Antioch's Bloom," Change, 4(September, 1972), pp. 47-58.

[66] Harvey D. Shapiro, "Lights That Failed," Review of Five Experimental Colleges, edited by Gary B. MacDonald, Change, 6(July-August, 1974), pp. 57-58.

[67] Karen J. Winkler, "Innovative, Exciting, or Freaky, Project Ten Gets 5-Year Trial," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (November 20, 1972), p. 1.

[68] Ann Heiss, An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform, op. cit., p. 19.

[69] Jerry G. Gaff, et al. The Cluster College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970). cf. especially the listing on pages 16-17 in which federated and subcolleges are grouped under the general heading of "subcollege."

[70] Ibid., p. 35.

[71] JB Lon Hefferlin, Dynamics of Academic Reform, op. cit., p. 25.

[72] The President's Commission on Higher Education, Higher Education for American Democracy, Volume I. Establishing the Goals (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 49.

[73] A. Lawrence Lowell, "The Choice of Electives," *At War with Academic Traditions in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934), p. 3. [Originally the article appeared in *The Harvard Monthly*, 1887.]

[74] A. Lawrence Lowell, "Annual Report for 1908-1909," *Ibid*., pp. 238-239.

[75] Executive Committee of the Cooperative Study in General Education, *Cooperation in General Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1947), p. vii.

[76] The Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society, *General Education in a Free Society* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955), p. 4.

[77] *Ibid*., p. 54.

[78] Russell Thomas, *The Search for a Common Learning: General Education 1800-1900* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 1.

[79] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Reform on Campus: Changing Students, Changing Academic Programs* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972), p. 42.

[80] *Ibid*., p. 43.

[81] *Ibid*., p. 45.

[82] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *The Purposes and the Performance of Higher Education in the United States: Approaching the Year 2000* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973), p. 41.

[83] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Priorities for Action*, *op. cit*., p. 28.

[84] Joseph Axelrod, et al. *Search for Relevance* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1969), pp. 64-65.

[85] *Ibid*., pp. 68-69.

[86] Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, *Undergraduate Curriculum Trends* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), p. 23.

[87] *Ibid*., p. 25.

[88] Dwight R. Ladd, *Change in Educational Policy: Self-Studies in Selected Colleges and Universities* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 170.

[89] *Ibid*., p. 171.

[90] Cf. Daniel Bell, *The Reforming of General Education: The Columbia Experience in Its National Setting* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966).

[91] Karen J. Winkler, "By Reforming General-Education Program, Columbia Hopes to Remotivate Students," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, VIII(December 3, 1973), p. 2.

[92] Dwight R. Ladd, Change in Educational Policy, op. cit., p. 172.

[93] Ibid., p. 176.

[94] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, op. cit., p. 50.

[95] Ibid., p. 51.

[96] Ibid., p. 27.

[97] Ibid., p. 29.

[98] Ibid., pp. 30, 35.

[99] Ibid., pp. 40-44.

[100] Fred M. Hechinger, "An Academic Counter-Revolution," Saturday Review World, II (November 16, 1974), p. 64.

[101] Ibid.

[102] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, op. cit., pp. 44-50.

[103] Ann Heiss, An Inventory of Academic Innovation, op. cit., p. 60.

[104] Ibid., p. 62.

[105] Beverly T. Watkins, "Student Demands for 'Practical' Education Are Forcing Major Changes in Curricula," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 26, 1973), p. 2.

[106] Malcolm G. Scully, "Student Focus on Practicality Hits Humanities," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (February 4, 1974), pp. 1, 3.

[107] Malcolm G. Scully, "Signs of a 'Counter-Reformation' Hearten Academic Conservatives," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (March 18, 1974), pp. 1, 6.

[108] Nathan Glaser, "Social Sciences and the Crisis of General Education," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 5, 1973), p. 16.

[109] Cf. "Student Demands for 'Practical' Education..." and "Student Focus on Practicality...."

[110] Samuel E. Kellams, "Students and the Decline of General Education," Journal of General Education, XXIV (January, 1973), p. 218.

[111] Stanley O. Ikenberry, "The Academy and General Education," Journal of General Education, XXIII (October, 1971), p. 177.

[112] James G. Rice, "General Education: Has Its Time Come Again?" Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (October, 1972), p. 533.

[113] Ibid., p. 536.

[114] Ibid., p. 538.

[115] Paul L. Dressel and Frances H. DeLisle, Undergraduate Curriculum Trends, op. cit., p. 27.

[116] Ibid.

[117] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, op. cit., p. 64.

[118] Dwight R. Ladd, Change in Educational Policy, op. cit., p. 181.

[119] Ibid., p. 184.

[120] Ann Heiss, An Inventory of Academic Innovation, op. cit., p. 73.

[121] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, op. cit., p. 80.

[122] "History Courses Losing Students: Survey Shows 12-pct. Enrollment Decline," Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (September 23, 1974), p. 7.

[123] Malcolm G. Scully, "Boom in Medieval Studies Is Seen As More than a Passing Fad," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 13, 1974), pp. 1, 10.

[124] Malcolm G. Scully, "Unprecedented Enrollment Drop Hits Languages," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (June 18, 1973), pp. 1, 3.

[125] Malcolm G. Scully, "Language Departments Fight Dip in Enrollments," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 12, 1973), p. 3.

126 Philip W. Semas, "Student Interest in Psychology is Booming," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (September 27, 1971), pp. 1, 6.

[127] Cheryl M. Fields, "5-10 Pct. of Students Major in Psychology, But After Graduation, What Do They Do?" Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (May 20, 1974), p. 9.

[128] Karen J. Winkler, "Sociologists Still in Demand, But Job Outlook Is Clouded," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (September 10, 1973), pp. 1, 6.

[129] Edward R. Weidlein, "'Relevance' Is Pressed In Poli Sci," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (October 16, 1972), p. 5.

[130] "Mixup in Chemistry: Simultaneous Booms and Shortages Upset Old Staffing Formulas," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (August 5, 1974), p. 7.

[131] Philip M. Boffey, "Energy Studies Seen Becoming 'Glamour Field,'" Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (December 24, 1973), pp. 1, 4.

[132] John A. Creager, Selected Policies and Practices in Higher Education, op. cit.

[133] John A. Crowl, "Black Studies: The Bitterness and Hostility Lessen, but Criticism Persists," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (May 30, 1972), pp. 6-7.

[134] "Poli-Sci's New Field: 'Black Politics,'" Chronicle of Higher Education, IX (November 4, 1974), p. 8.

[135] Wilson Record, "Response of Sociologists to Black Studies," Journal of Higher Education, XLV (May, 1974) pp. 364-391.

[136] Ibid., p. 391.

[137] Cheryl M. Fields, "White Ethnic Studies Are Spreading; They Focus On European Groups' Experiences in America," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (April 16, 1973), pp. 1, 6.

[138] Cheryl M. Fields, "Women's Studies Gain: 2,000 Courses Offered This Year," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (December 17, 1973), p. 6.

[139] Cf. Ann Heiss, An Inventory of Academic Innovation, op. cit., p. 47 ff.

[140] Jack Rossmann, "The Interim Term After Seven Years," Journal of Higher Education, XLII (October, 1971), p. 603.

[141] James Davis, "The Changing College Calendar," Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (February, 1972), pp. 142 ff.

[142] Eileen Kuhns and S.V. Martorana, "Of Time and Modules: The Organization of Instruction," Journal of Higher Education, XLV (June, 1974), p. 431.

> For a listing of some of the colleges with short winter inter-terms "or other academic calendars that vary from the traditional ones," cf. "149 Colleges with Innovative Calendars," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (January 21, 1974), pp. 9-10.

[143] Ibid., p. 437.

[144] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, Reform of Undergraduate Education, op. cit., pp. 125 ff.

[145] Dwight R. Ladd, Change in Educational Policy, op. cit., p. 190.

[146] Beverly T. Watkins, "A-to-F Grading System Heavily Favored By Undergraduate, Graduate Institutions," Chronicle of Higher Education, VIII (November 12, 1973), p. 2.

[147] Harold L. Hodgkinson, "Pass-Fail and the Protestant Ethic," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (December 11, 1972), p. 8.

[148] Barbara von Wittich, "The Impact of the Pass-Fail System upon Achievement of College Students," Journal of Higher Education, XLIII (June, 1972), pp. 499-508.

[149] Arthur Levine and John Weingart, *Reform of Undergraduate Education*, *op. cit*., p. 12.

[150] *Ibid*., p. 18.

[151] Dwight R. Ladd, *Change in Educational Policy*, *op. cit*., p. 163 ff.

[152] *Ibid*., pp. 164-165.

[153] Ann Heiss, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation*, *op. cit*., p. 56.

[154] *Ibid*., p. 59.

[155] Cf. Ann Heiss, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform*, *op. cit*., and K. Patricia Cross, et al. *Planning Non-Traditional Programs*, *op. cit*.

[156] Cf. especially W.G. Fleming, *Post-Secondary and Adult Education: Ontario's Educative Society*, Vol. IV (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971).

[157] Reginald Edwards, "Emerging National Policies for Higher Education in Canada," *Higher Education in a Changing World: The World Year Book of Education 1971/72*, edited by Brian Holmes and David G. Scanlon (New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1971), p. 329.

[158] Claude T. Bissell, "Canada," in *Higher Education: From Autonomy to Systems*, edited by James A. Perkins (New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1972), p. 176.

[159] W.G. Fleming, *Post-Secondary and Adult Education*, *op. cit*., cf. especially Chapter III.

[160] *Ibid*., p. 6, quote by Fleming from a report of the Committee of Presidents.

[161] Malcolm G. Scully, "Co-op Education, Alternating Work and Study, Gains Fans," *Chronicle of Higher Education* VIII (October 23, 1973), p. 7.

[162] Beverly T. Watkins, "Paper Campus," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, IX (September 30, 1974), p. 4.

[163] Larry A. Van Dyne, "External-Degree Programs Give New Life to University 'Extension,'" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, VI (May 22, 1972), pp. 1, 2.

[164] Dyckman W. Vermilye, *Lifelong Learners--A New Clientele for Higher Education*. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1974. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1974.) cf. also Council on Higher Education, State of Washington, *Exploring the External Degree* (Conference Report, May 24, 1973, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington) and *Journal of Higher Education*, XLIV (June, 1973).

[165] Commission on Non-Traditional Study, *Diversity by Design* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973), pp. 41, 42.

[166] Stephen K. Bailey, "Flexible Time-Space Programs: A Plea for Caution," The Expanded Campus. Current Issues in Higher Education, 1972, edited by Dyckman W. Vermilye (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1972), pp. 172-176.

[167] Cf. Philip W. Semas, "Bachelor's Degree in Three Years Gaining Favor," Chronicle of Higher Education, VI (January 31, 1972), p. 1, 5; and subsequent report, Philip W. Semas, "3-Year Degree Not Catching On As Anticipated," Chronicle of Higher Education, VII (May 14, 1973), p. 1, 5. Also, for a good overview, cf. Edward L. Allen, "The Three-Year Baccalaureate," Journal of General Education, XXV (April, 1973), pp. 61-73.